

# The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1878.

## The Week.

THE debate in the Senate on the Silver Bill was brought to a close on Friday afternoon, and the discussion and voting on the various amendments occupied the entire night. Towards five o'clock on Saturday morning the bill was passed by a more than two-thirds vote of 48 to 21. It provides for the coinage of 412½-grain silver dollars, to be "a legal tender at their nominal value for all debts and dues, public and private, except where otherwise expressly stipulated in the contract," and the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to purchase silver bullion at its market price, not less than two and not more than four million dollars' worth monthly, and to coin it into dollars monthly as fast as purchased, the Treasury to have the benefit of the seigniorage; but not more than \$5,000,000 shall at any one time be invested in uncoined bullion, and gold certificates of deposit shall not be payable in silver. It further directs the President to invite the Latin Union and such other European countries as he may deem advisable to a conference for the adoption of a common ratio of gold and silver, and of establishing internationally the use of bi-metallic money, and to appoint three commissioners on behalf of the United States to attend such conference. Finally, provision is made for the issue of silver certificates against deposits in the Treasury or Sub-treasuries of the United States.

The principal amendments rejected were those offered by the friends of honest money. By 46 to 21 the Senate rejected Mr. Morrill's proposal that for the first year not more than 25 per cent., and for the second year not more than 50 per cent., of customs dues should be payable in silver; by 46 to 23, Mr. Edmunds's proviso that the act should not interfere with the coinage of gold and subsidiary silver coins as now authorized by law; by 44 to 20, Mr. Morrill's proposal that payments on all uncompleted contracts should be made on the basis of value represented by United States notes at the time the contracts were made; by 44 to 25, Cameron's 420-grain dollar; by 46 to 23, Blaine's 425-grain dollar; by 49 to 18, Eaton's 440-grain dollar; by 46 to 20, Mr. Whyte's proposal to limit the legal-tender of silver to \$20, and, without calling the roll, Mr. Burnside's poor-man's proposal to limit it to debts and dues in excess of \$500; by 45 to 18, Mr. Sargent's proposal to except customs dues and interest on the public debt from payment in silver; without a roll-call, Mr. Morrill's proposal to retire and cancel five-dollar greenbacks in equal amounts with silver issues; by 46 to 14, Mr. Christiancy's proposal that silver and gold be interconvertible on demand at the Treasury, and that the coinage of either metal for private parties be prohibited, and subsequently a similar proposal by Mr. Butler, of South Carolina; and without a roll-call, Mr. Morrill's fixing the date of June 30, 1878, as the time for the bill to take effect. Mr. Christiancy's substitute was peremptorily rejected, and Mr. Blaine withdrew his as already hopelessly condemned. The bill as amended in Committee of the Whole was then reported to the Senate, when Mr. Kernan moved to amend by providing for the redemption and cancellation of the one and two-dollar Treasury notes. On motion of Mr. Ferry, reissue was substituted for cancellation by a vote of 42 to 25—a pure demonstration on the part of the anti-resumptionists, for the amendment as amended was then defeated by 54 to 10. This ended the struggle.

Other proceedings in Congress have been of slight moment. The old and tiresome question of what bargain was made by or for the President to prevent the Southerners from filibustering against

the decision of the Electoral Commission, and whether his course in withdrawing the troops from Louisiana was due to anything but his previously-formed conviction that it was his constitutional duty so to do, was sprung upon the House on Wednesday week as an incident of the debate on the Military Academy Appropriation Bill. Mr. Hewitt made dark allusions to buying and selling the Presidency, and said he had contemptuously refused a Louisiana offer to sell out to Tilden. Mr. Garfield denied any trafficking or bargaining on the part of Mr. Hayes; and Mr. Foster, the next day, denied again that the famous Wormley House interview involved any pledge on anybody's part, or any written document with signatures. On Tuesday Mr. Hale and Mr. Garfield had a good deal to say about the "persecutions" in Louisiana, and hinted that the Government might feel obliged to interfere. On Thursday there was a ludicrous episode in the House occasioned by a communication from Mr. Sherman in regard to the falling-off in the revenues, as brought to his notice by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. He accordingly recommended a reduction in the appropriations or an increase of taxation. This constitutional proceeding was resented by Fernando Wood as an attempt to dictate to Congress, and for the hundredth time it was shown how the President and his advisers are regarded by that body as hangers-on of the Government, having neither responsibility to the people nor any representative relations to them. It is one more argument in favor of getting the Cabinet on to the floor of Congress as soon as possible.

The leading speakers in the silver debate in the Senate have been Messrs. Bayard, Eaton, Randolph, Hill, Lamar, Kernan, Blaine, Christiancy, Edmunds, and Morrill, six of them, and the strongest, being Democrats. Moreover, two of the Republicans, Messrs. Blaine and Christiancy, proposed compromises which were simply trifling improvements on the original proposition. Mr. Lamar is perhaps entitled to more credit than any of them, as his vote will probably cost him his seat. He presented to the Senate on Saturday resolutions of the Mississippi Legislature instructing the State Senators to vote for the Silver Bill, which, however, he announced his intention of disregarding, in a short speech which for manliness, dignity, and pathos has never been surpassed in Congress. Any man there might be proud of having made it, and we doubt whether there is anything in the history of Mississippi nearly so creditable as having sent such a man to Congress. We trust, however, he will, since he sets his duty so high above all other considerations, go one step farther than disregard the resolutions, and refuse also to offer his resignation, which we have heard he proposes to do. The country needs now in Congress, as it has never needed them before, men who represent the whole Union, as distinguished from particular States and districts. Senators are in a peculiar degree bound to do so. The Republic at large ought to be their main concern. Owing to the practice of office-jobbing, and the increased dependence of Senators on local wirepullers, this has been almost completely forgotten, and in a crisis like this there is hardly anybody in either House to think and speak for the nation. At such a crisis, too, a man of Mr. Lamar's courage serves his State best by thinking only of the country. But how absurd and quixotic his performance must seem to Blaine and Conkling!

When the question of the appointment of a new Collector of the New York Custom-house was before the Senate in December last Mr. Conkling bore the most prominent part in that great debate. According to his principal newspaper admirer, "he spoke for an hour and a half, and his speech was described by those who heard it as being one of the most brilliant, eloquent, and able of his life"; and "his remarks were divided into three heads." During his speech "he was surrounded by piles of documents; his desk and the chairs

in his immediate vicinity were overburdened with books, papers, and letters." "When he alluded to General Arthur and Mr. Cornell he moved up and down the aisle, and spoke at the top of his voice, and clinched every sentence with violent gestures." In short, all his powers were brought into play; the occasion was great, and the man was equal to it. The revered names of "Arthur" and "Cornell" touched the inmost recesses of a rich nature. We are sorry to say that the account of his demeanor during the debate on the silver bill is not equally interesting. It is described by Mr. Nordhoff in the *Herald* as follows:

"Mr. Conkling's course was in melancholy contrast with that of Mr. Lamar. It was not merely that he did not speak, for he had repeatedly said to his friends he did not think a speech from himself on the subject likely to be effective to change the result, but his studied attitude all day and night of indifference to the speeches and movements of the opponents of the bill, his ostentatious display of contempt for the efforts made to check and limit the bad effects of the bill, and his equally ostentatious zeal in encouraging his friend Mr. Jones, of Nevada, and other extreme silver-men, in their demonstrations, were all so marked as to be the general topic of conversation in the galleries and on the floor. Indeed, he went so far that many persons believed he had made up his mind to vote for the bill, and when he voted no it was felt that he must have gone at last against his sympathies."

The *New York Times* has been making some very sneering and unhandsome observations on him for not making "the great effort" during the silver debate, and has also mentioned very discourteously the fact that after making a "great effort" on the formation of the Electoral Commission he kept out of the way, and did not vote when the Louisiana returns came up for adoption. The *Times* is probably alluding to the cruel though widely-believed story that the Great Citizen had been privy to a little plan for throwing out the Louisiana returns and having himself made President for one year, until a new election could be held, which was abandoned at the last moment. We think we can furnish a much more charitable explanation of his silence in the silver debate, and that is that he was studying "the mechanism of government." "One thing at a time," as the *Tribune* says. Mr. Conkling is no "Dutch theorist," and, therefore, makes sure that the "mechanism" is all right before coming to the discussion of ordinary political questions. As to the Louisiana affair, we think his absence must have been due to some accident to his toilette. His hair was probably tumbled, or his collar had gone awry.

Mr. Bayard Taylor's nomination for the German mission has been received with great and justifiable satisfaction, both as being positively good and as saving us from something possibly very bad. Mr. Taylor is very familiar with the German language and literature, and has had some diplomatic experience already, and is a sensible man who has seen a great deal of life and will serve the country with the highest credit. His appointment, owing to his being one of the editors of the *New York Tribune*, raised a very puzzling problem in "the amenities of journalism." Congratulation of an editor on any honor or reward outside his profession, or commendation of any appointment bestowed on him, may of course be readily construed as a compliment to the wretched or insignificant or infamous sheet with which he is connected, and this his professional brethren are naturally apt to shrink from. The *Times* solved the difficulty in the present case very dextrously by observing that, as Mr. Taylor's appointment was "credited" to Pennsylvania, it showed that Mr. Taylor's connection with the *Tribune* was "purely accidental," and it was gratifying inasmuch as it delivered a man of great intellectual calibre "from the necessity of earning a living by the sufferance of Jay Gould." A neater mode of killing two birds with one stone it would be hard to find.

The suit of the United States against Tilden for the recovery of unpaid income-tax, which Mr. George Bliss brought in the very last days of his District-Attorneyship, and left to his successor to prosecute, has been before the court ever since. The defendant, with

his accustomed wickedness, demurred, on the ground that the assessor's estimate, on which the tax was levied in the absence of a return, was final, and that the acceptance of the amount so fixed operated as a complete discharge. This plea has, however, after full argument, been overruled by the court, on the ground that the statute provided that the tax was to be levied on the income, and not on what the assessor said was the income. The case will now be tried on its merits, and we shall at last know what Tilden's income really was between 1862 and 1872. The drawback on the proceeding as a purifier of public morals is that it was begun simply as a means of annoying a political opponent in a canvass, and as his chances of again being a candidate are small, it is very doubtful whether it will ever be pushed to a conclusion.

Colonel Bob Ingersoll has lately occupied a good deal of attention in this city, and evidently furnished the theme to a great many metropolitan preachers, for an inordinate number of discourses on the Sunday following his lectures were on Hell, and one minister addressed himself to Colonel Bob directly and castigated him severely. The Colonel's first lecture on this same subject was a great success as far as numbers went, was reported in all the papers, and even reproduced in pamphlet form, and consisted of a droll stump-speech directed against the Christian religion. Encouraged by this he engaged the Hippodrome and made preparations for an audience of several thousands to hear him on Ghosts, but only about two hundred assembled for that purpose. The fact is that, looking at the matter from the business point of view, he ought to have reserved Hell for his last lecture. All other subjects will seem to his audiences who have enjoyed that, like thin claret to a man who has been regaling himself with apple-jack. There is, perhaps, nothing in recent history more curious than the Colonel's rise as a great theologian and the foe of theologians, considering that he passed middle life unknown to fame, and then made his mark by unsuccessfully proposing a doubtful candidate at a nominating convention. The lectures are a rehash of Tom Paine's, Voltaire's, and Theodore Parker's well-known arguments, with an intermixture of Western humor and the usual mushy eulogies on Love.

When it became known that the Senate had, by more than a two-thirds majority vote, passed the Silver Bill, retaining the provision for paying U. S. bonds principal and interest in 412½-grain dollars if the Government shall elect to make such payment, the price of gold in New York fell from 102½ to 102, and later to 101½; U. S. bonds advanced ½ to ¾ per cent., and in London ¼ to ½ per cent. (leaving them, however, ½ to ¾ below New York prices). By a looker-on in the markets it might have been inferred that the Senate had done something which was not only harmless, but of positive benefit to the credit of the Government. There is, however, such a thing as "manipulation" in the Stock Exchange markets on both sides of the ocean, and in the absence of any adverse speculation a show of sentiment favorable to the Silver Bill might have been brought about at no greater cost than a few brokers' commissions and the risk of a moderate amount of money. If the President, who has rested his opposition to silver remonetization on considerations of the public credit, could be persuaded that the bill would not only not injure the public credit, but would help it, such an outlay as we have spoken of would be a judicious investment. It is true that as the bill passed it was shorn of the free-coinage section, which would have brought silver here from all parts of the world, to be stamped as possessing a value 10 per cent. above its actual value; that an International Conference, after the act goes into operation, was authorized; and that the issue of 412½-grain dollars was restricted to \$4,000,000 per month. But with all these modifications the bill contained its repudiating feature; that is, it gave force and, so far as a statute can do it, effect to the declaration that the U. S. Government will save to itself 10 per cent. of what it owes. The fact that it cannot begin on this saving at once, and that possibly before the time comes when it can pay silver dollars they will be more valuable than now, does not alter the repudiating intent of the



bill. Whatever the temporary effect of the bill on the markets ought to have been, its ultimate effect on the public credit cannot be doubted. Silver in London advanced to 54½, and closed at 54½ to 54¾. Here the gold value of a 412½-grain dollar advanced from \$0.9010 to \$0.9068; the gold value of the "paper dollar" (the promise of the Government to pay one dollar) ranged during the week between \$0.9768 and \$0.9840.

If the bill shall become a law, the 412½-grain silver dollars will be bought by importers to use in paying duties at the Custom-house. For this purpose they can afford to pay .99 to .99½ for them; to the extent that they can be got will they be used for this purpose, and to that extent will all the coin receipts of the Treasury be in silver. For a while the Treasury will pay its interest in gold, but a time will come when the coin it will have will be silver. Then the fact that the bonds are silver obligations will be brought home to every holder of them. If silver shall then be 59d. per ounce, it will be the same to the holders as if they received gold, but to the silver agitators it will be a reason for another hostile movement on the "privileged class" which has savings to invest. If silver by that time shall rule below 59d. per ounce, then the bondholders will be the sufferers.

The London *Times* discusses the cause of the slight rise in United States bonds on the receipt of the news of the passage of the Silver Bill, and ascribes it to the stimulus given to the market by the report of better New York prices, and by the fact that the worst was now known, and proved not to be so bad as was feared. We are inclined to think, however, that the soundest explanation is that given by the New York *Herald*, which is that as the passage of the bill will permanently stop refunding at four per cent., it raises the value of the outstanding six per cents. by making it sure that they will not be called in, inasmuch as six per cent. in silver will, doubtless, be better than four per cent. in gold. Persons proposing investment in the West cannot be too cautious. The talk of a compulsory reduction in the rate of interest on outstanding loans has already begun, and in Illinois there are the first notes of clamor for a stay law. In fact, nobody can tell in how many new forms the swindling spirit will show itself during the next year or two.

The historian Sybel has published a pamphlet on the financial and commercial situation in Germany entitled "What We May Learn of the French," in which he publishes the Paris stock-list beside that of Berlin. There appears a terrible decline in the securities quoted in the latter this year, as compared with 1872, being little if any short of \$1,000,000,000, while the French have escaped almost unscathed in spite of their enormous losses through the war. One of the latest German jokes is, "What shall we do to the French if they seek revenge and attack us again? Pay them \$1,000,000,000." Von Sybel ascribes all the trouble to the Chinese apathy of the Germans, their want of national feeling, their want of confidence in the future of the country, and their passionate and unbridled political divisions. He makes no mention of the demonetization of silver, being probably a "gold-bug," "goldite," "money-sharp," and "Shylock." In fact, we believe there is no doubt the unconscionable knave has a little property.

The error of the threatening and distrustful policy pursued toward Russia by the British Ministry has been brought out very clearly by the first attempt to protect "British interests" by force. The entrance of the fleet into the Dardanelles caused the greatest anxiety in London, because there was every reason to fear that if the Turks and Russians joined hands it would never get out again, and the humiliation of its loss or capture would have been incalculable. Then the attempt of a power which had no army to fight with a power that had no fleet and a very large army, fifteen hundred miles from home, began to have a very ludicrous aspect when the time for action came. That England is not ready to go to war,

that she has no army, and that the recently-voted £6,000,000 will have to be used not to mobilize but to enlist and equip men for the field, is now freely acknowledged. The *Times* says that the officers are not familiar with mobilization; ambulances, transports, and medical organization are all wanting; and admits that all that Sir Stafford Northcote can do with his £6,000,000 is to shake it in the face of the Conference. By scraping together her whole available force, not over 30,000 effective men could be sent to Turkey, and there they would be reinforced by 30,000 or 40,000 more of the dregs and remnants of the Turkish army; and with this the job of chasing 300,000 Russians out of Rumelia would have to be undertaken. It is difficult to avoid the belief that when the exact nature of the situation dawns on the public in England the Ministry will find it impossible to maintain themselves.

The course of the Anglo-Turco-Russian complication is still obscure, but it seems to have re-entered on a peaceful phase, leaving England again in a somewhat worse diplomatic position than before. Her first error was in treating the Russian desire to command the Turkish line of defences at Tchadallye, twenty miles from Constantinople, as proof of an intention to occupy the city itself. Considering that Suleiman Pasha had escaped to Rodosto with thirty thousand men, and that the capital was occupied with a large body of armed refugees, and that the Turkish communications with Asia were open, there was nothing exorbitant in seeking to preclude the possibility of a renewed and desperate defence of the last Turkish line; and the march of the Russians on Gallipoli, which produced such a panic in London, is now acknowledged to have been due, and to have been directly ascribed by the Czar, to Suleiman's concentrating behind the works of that place. With a little reliance on Russian good faith, therefore, the fleet would not have been sent up to Constantinople under the pretence, at which everybody now smiles, that it was going to "protect the Christians." It was sent up, however, in defiance of the Sultan's prohibition, and this breach of the Treaty of Paris having been committed by her rival, Russia promptly withdrew her threat of occupying either the fortifications or the city. Austria, which showed some signs of irritation, was at the same time calmed down by Bismarck, who came forward at the moment for which he has probably long been waiting, and made everything between her and Russia so pleasant as to leave England once more out in the cold, and to provide for the meeting of the Conference at Baden-Baden probably, but somewhere certainly, within a few days.

Bismarck has at last appeared in the Reichstag, and, in reply to an "interpellation" about the Eastern question, spoke with a calmness and indifference which must have appeared very provoking in war-circles in London. The situation as described by him is in every way satisfactory. Russia, he says, has done nothing wrong, and means nothing wrong. He said there was no cause for anxiety about the Dardanelles or anything else. There would not be any general war. It was Russia's interest to satisfy Austria and England for the sake of future peace and quiet, and Austria and England must take the responsibility of the legacy left by Turkey. The Conference would meet early in March, and would settle everything. In any case, nothing would induce Germany to fight in this quarrel. In the Austrian Reichsrath and the Hungarian Diet Prince Auer-sperg and M. Tisza have made statements of somewhat similar character. Austria would not consider any arrangement between Russia and Turkey binding which had not the sanction of all the Powers, and, while willing to agree to everything which would ameliorate the condition of the Christians, must object to anything which seemed likely to alter the balance of power in the East to the detriment of Austria. But a Conference would settle everything. In the meantime the insurrection in Thessaly is spreading, and Serbia is making loud claims to the benefit of the *uti possidetis* rule, by holding on to her conquests in Turkey, and says she will only surrender them to superior force.

### "THE FATHERS" AND THEIR DOLLAR.

THERE has been nothing more prominent in the talk of the silver-organs during the last three-months, and nothing duller or drearier in their mendacity, than their iteration that their "fathers" used the silver dollar as their standard, and that it was taken away from them in 1873 by the Coinage Act, and that what they seek now is to have it restored to them. We believe, however, that, with their too common dishonesty, they have carefully refrained from publishing any figures on the subject, being well aware that the facts of the matter, if known, would make the theory of "the fathers' dollar" as ridiculous as the theory that the Coinage Act was passed secretly. The facts are that, from the establishment of the mint and the issue of a national coinage, in 1793, down to 1836, a period of forty-three years, only \$1,439,517 silver dollars were coined. At the first-mentioned date the population was, in round numbers, 4,000,000; and allowing one "Father" to each five persons, which is the usual calculation, there were in all 800,000 Fathers, so that they started with less than two silver dollars apiece—or, if we suppose them to have divided with the Mothers, they each had less than one dollar. The Fathers and Mothers, however, went on increasing, while the silver dollars did not, for, strange to say, there was no demand for them. The whole \$1,439,517 had been issued before the year 1805, and from that year until 1836 not one was coined. In 1810 the population had reached (in round numbers) 7,000,000, and the supply of dollars remained the same, so that there were 1,400,000 Fathers, and only about one dollar each for them, leaving none for the Mothers. In 1820 the population was 9,000,000, and there were 1,800,000 Fathers, so that there were 300,000 Fathers who had no dollar at all, and the prospects of the Mothers were more hopeless than ever. In 1830 the population was 12,000,000 (it was nearer 13,000,000, but we are throwing off the old figures), and there were 2,400,000 Fathers, so that there were 900,000 without a silver dollar. In 1836 relief came, and yet very slight relief; for but a few dollars were coined every year, so that only \$6,606,321 were issued between 1836 and 1873, and the greater part of these after 1860. In 1860 the population was 31,000,000, and—many people who have been listening to the tuneless silver-man will scarcely credit it, but it is nevertheless true—the amount of silver dollars which had been coined up to that time (we do not say they were in circulation, or even in existence) was only \$2,827,320. Supposing them, however, to have been all in circulation, there were 3,372,680 Fathers who had not one silver dollar in the world, and 2,827,320 who had only one dollar each. The Mothers had none, nor the grown-up Sons and Daughters; of course the Aunts and Uncles were equally destitute.

How, then, it will be asked, did the Fathers carry on their business? What did they settle their accounts in? If the silver dollar was the dollar of their hearts, why did they not clamor for more silver coinage? Well, the fact is they carried on business in *gold*, or in bank-bills redeemable, or supposed to be redeemable, in gold. In short, they were "goldites," "gold-bugs," and "gold-sharps." This is a sorrowful truth, but truth it is. The official records do not lie, strange as it may seem to some gentlemen out West, who have lately been lying much, and to whom it probably seems natural that everything and everybody should lie. The Mint from the very first year began coining eagles, half-eagles, and quarter-eagles. It issued eagles every year down to 1805, when it stopped until 1833. It issued half-eagles every year except 1816, 1817, down to 1873—the year of the "conspiracy"—and has issued them every year since. It issued quarter-eagles every year down to 1808, when it stopped until 1821, and then resumed; paused again until 1824, and then resumed once more, and has continued ever since. In 1850 it began coining gold dollars; in 1855, three-dollar gold pieces. We finally come upon the damning fact that before the year 1873 the Mint had coined and issued \$816,422,042 in gold, against \$8,045,838 in silver dollars. We take no count here of the small silver "change." Of course there was a good deal of that issued, say \$150,000,000; but this does not fur-

nish a standard of value or a means of carrying on the trade of the country, being merely used for small purchases. So that what the silver-men would have us believe, although the more intelligent and rational of them do not believe it themselves, is that while the United States were growing from a nation of four millions to thirteen millions, and increasing their trade and industry in an unprecedented ratio, they carried on business with a standard composed of one million and a half of silver dollars, and that they rose into a nation of forty millions, with a corresponding increase in wealth, on a basis of eight million silver dollars; and that the eight hundred million dollars coined in gold during this period were a mere luxury; and, finally, that when silver was demonetized in 1873, none of this eight millions being in circulation and very little of it in the country—even the small change being all gone—it helped to bring about the great decline in the value of silver which began in 1875.

This leads us to say a few words in conclusion about the "standard" of a country as distinguished from its "legal tender." This is probably the only point in the controversy on which the silver-organs, and especially the *Chicago Tribune* and the *Cincinnati Commercial*, have not been guilty of wilful falsehood, and falsehood repeated over and over with dull pertinacity. On this we do not think they have been wilfully untruthful, because we do not believe they have been able to get the distinction into their heads. When you find a silver-editor talking of "standard" and "legal tender" as if they were synonymous terms, and you stop him and point out the important difference between them, he gazes at you for a moment in a dazed, bovine way, and then begins repeating in the same sing-song, "Standard and legal tender, legal tender and standard, all the same." No one, however, who has not got a firm hold of this distinction, and cannot keep his hold of it, ought to open his mouth in public about currency, any more than offer to repair a watch or navigate a ship, never having learnt watchmaking and never having been at sea. The standard of value is a measure, created by popular consensus, which people use—i.e., have in their minds—in buying and selling, and contracting or settling their current accounts. It may be legal tender also, and generally is; but it may not be the *only* legal tender, and sometimes is not. Legal tender, on the other hand, is the money or other commodity in which it is *lawful* for a man to pay or offer to pay his debts, if he pleases; it *may* be also the standard of value in general use, and generally is, but it sometimes is not. For example, in California gold has always been the standard of value. In buying and selling, and contracting and settling accounts, Californians have had gold and gold only in their minds when making their bargains, and have meant gold in their figures. Nevertheless, greenbacks have since 1862 been a legal tender—that is, a currency in which a man owing money to another *might* pay his debts. So strong, however, has been the popular consensus in favor of gold, that any man who attempted to use paper as the standard by availing himself of its legal-tender quality would have been disgraced. So also most or a great many of the foreign merchants in this city have for many years used gold as the standard in all their sales and purchases and contracts, even if they actually squared their accounts in greenbacks. That is, if they paid in greenbacks they did so with gold in their mind, giving greenbacks at their value in gold.

The history of American coinage since 1793 is another illustration of the distinction. Silver was down to 1862 a legal tender as well as gold, but it was not the standard. Nobody had it in his mind in buying or selling except in very small amounts, or in keeping his accounts or making contracts *de futuro*. What every one meant and thought of in talking of prices was prices in gold. He may have paid in bank-bills or checks, but they were checks or bank-bills redeemable in gold. He did not think of silver, or call for it; had he done so, of course it would have been coined and brought into use in large quantities. All this time silver was a legal tender; that is, a man might, if he pleased, have paid any debt in it, just as during the last fifteen years he might in California have paid his debts in paper; or just as here he might dur-



ing the same period have paid it in gold. So that the truth is, as we have said, the Fathers were "goldites." They used no silver except in small change; they had none to use, and did not call for it. They did all their business for sixty-seven years on a gold basis, and thought only of gold in making their contracts. The standard of the United States, in short, was from the foundation of the Government to the outbreak of the war the gold standard, and there was only *one* standard, although there were *two* legal tenders. Every child ought to have this distinction worked into his head, no matter what time or trouble it may take, and all the grown-up people whose minds are still flexible enough to entertain new ideas, ought to work at it until they grasp it; and until they have done so, especially if editors, keep dead silence about currency questions.

#### SOME MEMORANDA ABOUT LOUISIANA AFFAIRS.

THE fresh outbreak of excitement about the Louisiana Returning Board seems to show that a good many well-meaning people have forgotten several important things, to which we shall take the liberty of recalling their attention.

1. That it was widely believed, and with good reason, before the meeting of the Electoral Commission, that the Louisiana Returning Board had been guilty of fraud, and that no one could take the Presidential chair with a satisfactory title who owed it to the discretionary counting of persons in whom so little confidence was felt as the members of that body. The great reason for rejoicing over the appointment of the Commission, and its decision that it could not go behind the face of the returns, was, therefore, not simply that it put an end to strife and turmoil, but that it relieved President Hayes from all dependence on and obligation to the disreputable Republican politicians of Louisiana, and enabled him to repudiate all connection with them and responsibility for them.

2. That it was much to be regretted that he should have unnecessarily renewed or prolonged this connection by giving the two principal members of the Board high offices in the Custom-house, thus giving color to the charge that he was indebted to them, and perpetuating the irritation which their connection with local politics had caused, and, as it were, snubbing the whole body of New Orleans merchants who have dealings with the Custom-house, and who believed both Wells and Anderson to be dishonest. It was rendered the more objectionable by the fact that the Custom-house in that city had long been sunk in far deeper corruption than that of New York City, and stood in far greater need of a reformatory break with old practices and management.

3. That the charge that the prosecution of Wells and Anderson is "a breach of faith" implies that President Hayes withdrew the troops in consequence of some pledge from Governor Nicholls and the Legislature. If, however, they are the lawful Governor and Legislature, they were entitled to the control of the State without any pledge, President Hayes not being an armed invader, but the chief officer of a Constitutional Government, and bound to act in all things according to law. If they were not the lawful Governor and Legislature, no pledge could have justified his surrender of the State to them; so that no matter in what light we regard them, it is very impolitic of the Administration or any of its members to talk of any pledge as having influenced the President's action. To do him justice, he has again and again averred that he did in Louisiana only what it was his constitutional duty to do; and General Garfield, who was one of the "visiting statesmen," has within a week repeated this statement in the House. Consequently, his doing it can have bound no one to follow or avoid any course of conduct.

4. That, in point of fact, no pledge or promise not to prosecute anybody for past "political offences" was, as has been alleged, made either by Governor Nicholls or the Legislature. The resolution of the Legislature promises not "to persecute any one for past political conduct." But legal prosecution is not and ought not to be held to be "persecution," and criminal offences are not "political conduct." The offence with which Wells and Anderson are charged

is the offence described in the Louisiana Revised Statutes, "of publishing as true any false, altered, forged, or counterfeited public record, knowing the same, etc., with intent to injure or defraud any person or any body, politic or corporate," and is punishable by imprisonment at hard labor for not less than two or more than fourteen years. By the same statutes, having knowledge of such a crime without communicating it to some committing magistrate or district-attorney is punishable by a fine and imprisonment with hard labor. To cite these statutes is to show the extreme impropriety—to use a very mild word—of the President's claiming any immunity for anybody from their operation.

5. That under the American system of jurisprudence, the proper defence against wrongful or false charge is a trial in open court by a jury under the procedure fixed by the common and statute law; and the only remedy for defects in such procedure, or the misconduct of the judge or jury, is an application for a new trial or an appeal to a higher court. The notion that such protection or remedy is to be found in appeal to the sympathy or gratitude of the President of the United States, or to any other great man, is as novel as it is mischievous, and seems to be borrowed from the practices of the various Oriental monarchies and khanates. It becomes more absurd when the court complained of is a State court, and when the prisoner for whom this extraordinary privilege is claimed is simply a member of a Southern Returning Board. The degree to which the public mind has been benumbed on this subject is shown by the following passage, which we extract not, as might be supposed, from *Blackwood's Magazine* or the *Kreuz-Zeitung*, but from a leading American newspaper published in the city of Boston:

"It is not believed at Washington that either Anderson or Wells was criminally connected with the alteration of the Vernon parish returns. They will both be found guilty of the deed which they did not commit. If the general Government cannot legally or constitutionally interfere to prevent such a travesty of justice from being executed as the imprisonment of these two men, there is a gap in the practical working of our institutions which should be filled. Probably some way will be found to head off the plots of those who would thus revive old sectional feelings."

It is here forgotten that the belief of persons in distant cities about the value of evidence which they have not heard of is of no consequence under American law, and that "the gap in the practical working of our institutions" which prevents the President from revising the decisions of State courts was left there purposely by the founders of the Government, the excellence of which is, indeed, largely due to the number and magnitude of similar "gaps." If the President has had to consult the Attorney-General as to whether he can interfere when he dislikes the result of trials in State courts for breaches of State law, it furnishes a new and strange illustration of the degeneration of our political thought wrought by the carpet-bag régime.

6. That the fact that the State judge who tries an offence was a defaulter before he went on the bench is a proof of great laxity of public morals on the part of the community which elects or tolerates him, and is an evil to be remedied by State opinion; but that the judge's character gives a prisoner tried before him a right of appeal to Washington is a grotesque idea, which has some of the marks of convivial origin. So also is the idea that, though the President or Cabinet would have no right to protest against such a judge trying cases in which they felt no interest, they may lawfully protest or interfere when he tries somebody whom they esteem and believe innocent; the fact being that, if entitled on this ground to interfere with State courts at all, the poor and helpless defendants whom they do not know, have a far better claim to such interference than the rich and conspicuous ones whom they do know. Every man in Louisiana deserves as good a judge as Anderson, and whatever is done to protect one person against such an officer ought to be done for all.

7. That so long ago as 1867 General Sheridan made a report to his superiors in Washington on the state of things in New Orleans, in which he described J. Madison Wells, after prolonged observa-

tion, as "notoriously corrupt," as "a political trickster and dishonest man," and declared "that he had not one honest man among his friends," and he therefore removed him from the State governorship. He also charged him with lobbying an appropriation of \$4,000,000 through the Legislature for the repairs of the levees, "in order to fatten some of the money himself." That in 1872 the Congressional Committee, after examination on the spot, pronounced the action of this same Wells and Anderson on the Returning Board "arbitrary, unjust, and illegal," and that there is no good reason for believing that either of them has since then grown in grace or improved morally in any department of human activity. That though this may not prove, or help to prove, that they committed the offence for which they are now on trial, it does furnish strong evidence of the impropriety of any attempt to raise the proceedings against them into the rank of a national concern, or plunge the President and his Cabinet into attempts to save them either by means of unlawful acts or unseemly language. Finally, that the practice of telegraphing or writing from great distances that trials which cause you annoyance, or in which a person whom you like or trust is the defendant, are "outrages" or "travesties of justice," is not only un-American but would in any country or under any system of jurisprudence be considered somewhat silly.

#### PARTY DISSOLUTION AT WASHINGTON.

WASHINGTON, February 18.

THE general impression with regard to the Silver Bill and the veto is that the President has not sufficient influence left in the Senate to secure the one or two votes necessary to prevent the passage of the bill. I do not believe, however, that this is by any means certain. If a determined effort should be made during the next ten days to obtain votes by the President directly, or by Mr. Sherman, there is no saying what might be the result, and many hitherto thoughtful civil-service reformers will probably within that period begin to doubt whether on the whole it is not better to have the effort made to influence the Senate, even at the expense of a little principle, than to trust the credit and honor of the country entirely to the mercy of Congress uninfluenced by the Executive. There is little doubt that a successful veto would be a death-blow to the silver agitators; the process of getting any measure of importance through Congress is so tedious and cumbrous that once blocked it is difficult to begin over again; and the Bland Bill would probably share the fate of the inflation measure vetoed by General Grant, if only the necessary votes to support the President could be found. It is all wrong, of course, to bribe Senators with offers of patronage, and civil-service reform does not lie that way. But then, cynical persons will say, Are we getting civil-service reform? Is it civil-service reform to keep Wells and Anderson in office at New Orleans, and to send McLin to New Mexico, and to offer Arthur a consulship to get him out of New York? Is it worth while, in order to get such reform as this, for the Executive to throw away its control over legislation, and so let Congress ruin the credit of the country? These are questions which just now are passing through the heads of a good many supporters of the President, who sincerely believe in his civil-service policy—as announced. It is a curious illustration of the contradictory impressions the President produces upon people with whom he comes in contact, that there are intelligent men here who will assure you that he will never veto the bill; that he is at heart in favor of remonetization; that the Stanley Matthews resolutions declaring the bonds payable in silver were introduced in order to give him an easy way out of his difficulties, by enabling him to shelter his approval of the Bland Bill behind a recorded declaration of the two Houses on the subject. All doubts of this kind will be very soon set at rest; but they are interesting as showing that the great mystery of the campaign of 1876, as to the exact nature of Mr. Hayes's real convictions and beliefs on political subjects, is still unsolved. One thing, however, the silver debate has made very clear, and that is that the general policy of the Administration during the past year has reduced it almost to a position of isolation. It has not pleased the civil-service reformers, it has disgusted the Radical Republicans, and it has not detached a single Democrat from his party allegiance.

Indeed, the present condition of the political atmosphere at Washington is more remarkable, to any one who takes a philosophical interest in government, than at any time since the close of the war. Every negative sign points in one direction—to the disruption of the old parties and the

creation of new ones. There is nothing on which either organization is united or has the slightest conviction. Democrats will tell you this as well as Republicans. The vote on the Silver Bill shows a very even division of parties on the currency question; there are no party lines any longer on the tariff. Mr. Wood's bill was concocted precisely as General Schenck would have concocted one ten years ago—not as a measure of civilized and enlightened taxation, but as a compromise of interests, combined with what you have recently called the "happy-thought" system. For instance: "Free-traders want Free-trade; Protectionists want protection; happy thought—have both. Increase free list, tax raw materials, please everybody." But nobody is pleased. So with regard to internal taxation: there are no party lines, and a Democratic House proposes to re-enact the income tax, which was the subject of the universal execration of the Democratic party through the war. As to civil-service reform, neither party can be said to be in favor of it, and, what is more, neither party believes that the other has any real intention of carrying into effect its professed intentions with regard to it. As to the South, the total impossibility of doing anything to reverse the action of the Executive prevents it from being really a question of moment. All these negative indications point to a disintegration of parties; are there no signs pointing to the appearance of a new one? Everybody disagrees with everybody else about the old questions; are there no new subjects upon which there is an agreement? If there were any body of men, however small, in either house of Congress who acted readily together in opposition to both parties, in favor of some distinct policy, there would be reason to look for the rise of a new organization. So far as measures of reform are concerned, there is certainly no sign of anything of the kind. Such members of the House as Messrs. Hewitt, J. D. Cox, and Randall Gibson, to mention three of the best representatives of that body, who probably think alike at bottom on most political questions, have no positive platform to stand upon. Messrs. Lamar, Hill, Randolph, and Bayard in the Senate are in the same plight. What sort of a position have these gentlemen been put in during the past four months? Simply that of opposing an iniquitous scheme of spoliation supported by two-thirds of their colleagues. There are no men in Washington who are better qualified by training and experience than those I have mentioned to be foremost in a new party movement—in favor of some rational policy in the interest of the whole country; but instead of that, they are reduced to wage a losing fight against Communists and Repudiators.

But while there are no indications at Washington of a formation of a new party such as reformers have been dreaming of, there are certainly signs enough of a movement such as reformers never contemplated. During the past five years we know very well that in the South large bodies of men have become accustomed to act together in the interest of a "reduction of the burdens of taxation," by means variously known as "readjustment," "scaling," and repudiation. In almost all the leading Southern States long-continued commercial and industrial depression has resulted in the formation of a party pledged openly and firmly to cut down State debts. A national party of the same sort has undoubtedly shown its head at Washington, and unless it is killed now will gather force. The sort of talk lately indulged in by Senator Voorhees and Mr. Bland, and their followers, is precisely like that of the Southern repudiators; and, I may add, closely resembles the harangues sometimes heard in that metropolitan cradle of liberty—Tompkins Square—from Mr. Justus Schwab and Citizen Maddox. This party has an organization, a treasury, energetic leaders; it knows what it wants. In short, we cannot any longer say that we are without a new party, and an active and powerful party; one made up of defections from the old parties; but it is not a party of reform, but of national dishonor and humiliation.

Meanwhile, what is Congress doing in its numerous other fields of activity? It is, of course, busily engaged in preparing the appropriation bills in committee; but beyond this there does not seem much probability of any general legislation at this session. Subsidies have been killed, or at any rate scotched, by a resolution of the House; and on no other subject is there any agreement. With regard to the appropriations, the Democrats in the House deserve great credit for their honest efforts at reduction of expenses in every direction. But it is evident that their efforts are also frequently misguided. They have an ideal in mind which is not an ideal fit for the adoption of a government of the size and complexity of ours. The majority in the House is, it should be remembered, a rural majority; it comes from parts of the country in which the "simplicity and economy of our forefathers" are kept in view as the best attainable standard in the conduct of life. In the zeal with which these members endeavor to restore a state of things which never



existed, there is something even more touching than in the attempts of certain municipal reformers to purify and reorganize the primaries in cities. Grave doubts exist in their minds as to whether anybody, under any circumstances, ought to spend more than \$2,000 a year; and whether Government expenditures on anything above the grade of absolute necessities is not immoral. Every legislator brings to Washington with him a certain standard of living, a scale of expense, which he involuntarily applies to the Government; it is obvious that the scale brought up from the impoverished South must be a very different standard from that which used to be applied in the palmy days of the Republican régime, when legislation was in the hands of a part of the country where luxury and wealth were common, and where money was easily made and lightly spent. The new spirit of economy has come just in time, and if we are to have no choice between corruption and waste on the one hand, and misguided economy on the other, the latter is unquestionably the least of the two evils. The worst effect of the new spirit is shown in connection with appropriations for national objects of an important character, which have no active lobby in their favor, and which may therefore be attacked with impunity. Government surveys, Government expenditures for professional or technical objects, are scrutinized with a more jealous but less instructed eye than in the old days before the panic and the Democratic "tidal wave." Persons connected with branches of the public service in which expenditures of this sort are needed complain bitterly of the restrictions under which they are placed, and sigh for the good old times when money could be got for the asking, and deficiency bills were looked upon as a matter of course.

Possession of one branch of Congress, however, combined with the prospect of the speedy possession of the other, has already begun to sap the reforming zeal of the Democrats to a great extent, and the passion for investigation which, on the eve of an important Presidential campaign, possessed the party, shows signs of waning. The general investigation of all the departments set on foot a month or so since has thus far resulted in nothing, and it is not supposed that much will come of it.

A very important measure has been introduced in the House, which seems to have a good deal of support from the Southern members—to refer all claims against the Government for settlement to the courts. The history of the Court of Claims shows, as might be expected, that the Government interests are far better protected by judges than by irresponsible committees of Congress, and that Court has exhibited no dangerous inclination to extend its jurisdiction unduly. Claimants, of course, fare better in any court than before Congress, because their rights are defined by decisions and statutes, and there is some possibility of ascertaining beforehand what claims should be pressed and what stand no chance. On these and a great many other accounts there is every reason to hope that sooner or later the whole jurisdiction of Congress over claims, the history of which contains so long a record of injustice and spoliation, will be abandoned to the courts. With an inferior court, such as the Court of Claims, and an appeal to the Supreme Court, the Government being represented by counsel in both, there would be a speedy end to the greater part of the scandals which now grow out of the prosecution of claims.

Before this is done there will have to be some reorganization of the Supreme Court, which is now three years in arrears with its business, and is entirely unable to cope with the constantly-increasing volume of it. This matter has been taken up, I believe, by the Bar Association of this city. Some legislation on the subject will no doubt be attempted. It is much to be hoped that the crude method of keeping the amount of business down by a pecuniary limit will not be pushed any further than it has been already. It is safe to say that no more undemocratic or unjust feature can possibly exist in a judicial system. There is no connection whatever between the amount of money involved in a suit and the right of appeal. The right to obtain the opinion of the Supreme Court on a question of law ought to depend solely upon the importance or the federal character of the matter in issue. The idea that a suitor should be enabled to appeal to the Supreme Court because his case involves a large amount of money, when another whose pecuniary interests at stake are small cannot, is an idea which would seem, were we not familiar with it, essentially the product of a government of caste and privileges, and not of equal rights.

Of the claims now before Congress, the most interesting, from a public point of view, are still those growing out of the Geneva Award. To the old dispute between the insurance companies, the war-premium and the "exculpated"-cruiser claimants, there is now likely to be added a new one growing out of the Canadian Fishery Award. In accordance with the Treaty of Washington and this award under it, we are called

upon to pay \$5,000,000 to England for the right of fishing granted to American fishermen in Canadian waters. The recent visit of Lord Dufferin to this city was supposed to be connected with this matter. He was anxious, it was understood, to find out whether we proposed to pay or not. If he got any definite assurances on the subject he was very lucky, and those who made them were very rash. There will, without question, be a good deal of opposition to the payment of the award in Congress. General Butler has stated that he is opposed to the whole thing—not on account of the money, but as a matter of principle. It is said that Mr. Ensign H. Kellogg, the American Commissioner, had an opportunity to reduce the amount of the award, as it was intimated to him by his colleagues that if he would sign it they would take off a million or so. But he, too, refused—perhaps also on principle.

What is to be the fate of the Geneva Award will probably be settled at this session of Congress. The fund still undistributed is a large one—not far from \$10,000,000. A number of hearings have been had before the House Judiciary Committee, and still others before a sub-committee of that body which has been appointed to draft a bill. So far as can be inferred from the indications at the hearings, the Committee is in favor of some sort of distribution, and several of the members are known to be disposed to recognize the insurance claims. The great promoter of the war-premium and "exculpated"-cruiser claims, General Butler, is very active in behalf of that interest, and it is difficult to say what the result will be. There is no doubt that the insurance companies have a better chance than they had last year, though that is not saying a great deal, and there is equally little doubt that, if the present session goes by without any distribution of the fund, the money will remain forever in the Treasury.

#### FOOD-ADULTERATIONS IN GERMANY.

GERMANY, January 15, 1878.

AT a meeting of apothecaries some weeks ago one of the learned gentlemen stated that Schiller's study had been recently discovered to have been formerly papered with a green paper-hanging. Upon examination this had been found to contain a quantity of arsenic great enough to explain the sufferings and the early death of the poet. I cannot vouch for the correctness of these assertions; but if they be true, our literature, for aught we know, might have had half a dozen other tragedies like "Wallenstein" to boast of, if Schiller's landlord had chanced to select a blue instead of a green paper for this particular room. Perhaps the poet was inhaling the deadly poison when, in his "Geschichte des Abfalls der vereinigten Niederlande," he penned the following lines: "The whole earthly happiness, even the life, of the honest man was now given into the hands of every rascal. . . . The truth of social intercourse was gone. . . . Social life was poisoned by a contagious distrust. . . . No honest man was trusted by the people, and nobody was believed to be honest." He, however, assuredly would not have deemed it possible that another age should be in store for mankind of which some misanthrope might be tempted to say the very same things, and that the secret causes by which he himself was hurried to his premature grave were the forerunners of this age. The Spanish Inquisition certainly, and grand but dark political plots and schemes like those of Philip II., have nothing to do with the fact that "the whole earthly happiness, even the life, of the honest man is now given into the hands of every rascal." Not the Dominicans, but a great number of manufacturers and trades-people, are after us, and these are not seeking souls *ad maiorem Dei gloriam*, but merely pennies. Some of these gentry are satisfied with betraying thousands of the hope of regaining their health; they only substitute some worthless stuff for the valuable and costly things they pretend to sell; others gradually, but directly, systematically, and surely ruin the health of thousands by adulterating their wares with some more or less strong poison, or using poisonous ingredients to make them "show off" better; and still others suffer themselves to be betrayed by their lust of gain into a wholesale slaughter. One need not be a sentimentalist to be, in all soberness, deeply convinced that here too is a "social question" of really awful import.

Allow me to make good this assertion by mentioning a few of the numberless cases which, in the last nine or ten months, have come to my knowledge just in reading my daily paper. I shall take care not to give the whole list, in order not to tempt any Pharisee to construct the whole bird out of one feather and to ask whether the proverbial virtue of the Germans, sterling honesty, is to be found anywhere except in the readers of our school-boys. Not very long ago the Society of Housewives in one of the larger cities—if I remember right it was Leipzig—got a lot of sau-

sages from some other place renowned for its fabrication of this favorite dish of all Germans. The law forbids any pork to be sold without having been examined under the microscope. In spite of that these sausages were so filled with trichina that about a hundred persons are said to have become, in a greater or less degree, the victims of this dreadful disease. In the summer two butchers of a smaller town in Saxony bought a cow so sick that they had to transport her on a wagon, and barely got her alive into the slaughter-house. Over a hundred persons who ate of the meat fell dangerously sick, and nearly a dozen died.

These are the worst cases as to the immediate results, but the guilty parties can, perhaps, only be accused of criminal negligence and dereliction of duty. From a certain point of view, therefore, the following examples represent a higher grade of the evil. A gentleman on whom the physicians had for many years tried in vain their skill and their wit, was at last found to be poisoned by lead; every time he opened his snuff-box he took some particles of lead with the weed. It would be interesting to know how many persons, in the course of years, the manufacturer had subjected to the same process of slow poisoning by using, against the law, lead-paper wrappings in order to save as much as, perhaps, this one man had spent on his physicians and in watering-places. Last summer the public were officially warned to beware of baby-carriages with a roofing of a certain white oil-cloth containing a great amount of lead; in some places all these carriages were confiscated. Quite recently the wall-paper manufacturers have been reminded of the law forbidding them to use the poisonous aniline colors. These same aniline colors are used to a great extent for "freshing up" old sausages and poor meat, and for "making" wine. I remember to have read last year three times of enormous amounts of "wine" having been emptied into the gutters by the authorities because they contained *Fuchsine*. A large wine business of good repute in Berlin, whose specialty was the purest and dearest wines for sick people, has been closed because, as the papers report, there was not a single drop of real wine in the bottles. One-half of the twenty different kinds of beer brewed or sold in Berlin are officially declared not to consist of malt and hops. It is the more satisfactory to know this, inasmuch as the authorities have had the kind consideration for the poor adulterators not to tell which beers are beers. The honest brewers are likely to have the same experience as the German chocolate manufacturers. During the last four or five years a Dutch firm, Van Houten, sold enormous quantities of its cacao in Germany, although it was considerably dearer than the best offered by the German manufacturers. The physicians recommended it very highly because it was warranted to be absolutely pure. Now, upon examination, it is found to be, if not directly adulterated, yet prepared in such a way with different chemicals as to have the effect of a bad adulteration. The thousands who have indulged in this luxury in order to improve their digestive organs have now the satisfaction of knowing that these were not weakened to such a degree as to be unable to stand even this "baby's delight," but that it requires a very strong stomach to partake of it for any length of time without harm. Van Houten's proceedings, however, compare very favorably with those of a number of his German competitors. Stollwerck Brothers, in Cologne, have had seventeen kinds of German chocolate analyzed. "The results were incredible; nine of them contained no cacao at all; only ground cacao-pulps, common browned flour, and bad sugar were the ingredients. In two cases there were, besides, found—not to speak of the addition of vegetable dyes—5 and 10 per cent. respectively of cauk. Of this the manufacturers themselves had no knowledge; upon further examination, it was traced to the adulterated flour from Bucholz, in Hanover, which they had used."

The last sentence points to the worst feature of the evil. It seems almost impossible to protect the public effectually against these modern harpies, as they themselves are often the victims of their own kith and kin. It is already almost difficult to name half a dozen kinds of food which are never adulterated. If one wants to be absolutely sure that it is food he has on the table, and not a wonderful mixture of minerals, dyes, and nameless liquids, he has to send everything to be examined beforehand. Perhaps it would come to that if the analyzing did not take so much time and if the pleasure were not so very costly. Some people, however, can hardly afford to avoid the trouble and the expense. Our farmers have been repeatedly warned not to buy clover-seeds or artificial manure without having it examined at a "landwirthschaftliche Versuchsstation" (agricultural experiment station). It is bad enough to cheat people into sowing pebbles instead of seeds, or into ploughing poison instead of manure into the ground; but it is much worse to make them eat chaff, pebbles, and poison, and to make them give poisonous playthings to their

children. Our lawgivers do not overlook this. Bismarck personally takes a lively interest in these questions, and the *Reichs-Gesundheitsamt* has commenced a most determined crusade against these *hostes generis humani*. A commission, presided over by the President of the *Reichs-justizamt*, Dr. Friedberg, is now in Berlin at work draughting a bill to prevent the adulteration of eatables and drinkables and the use of materials detrimental to health in the manufacture of wall-papers, wearing apparel, toys, etc. As the basis for their deliberations the commission have adopted the proposals of a committee of experts which, under the auspices of the *Reichs-Gesundheitsamt*, has had the subject in consideration from the technical point of view. The Reichstag is expected to meet in February, and this bill will probably be introduced in the course of the session. The statesmen of other countries may find it worth while to bestow some attention on the debates that are likely to arise over it. With us nobody expects to see the great problem at once successfully solved, and nobody thinks that the law alone can bring about a satisfactory solution. Public opinion, which hitherto has been criminally lenient towards this worst class of thieves, must fix an ineffaceable brand on their foreheads, and the honest manufacturers must firmly stand together against these birds of prey, who, indirectly but often none the less effectually, deprive them not only of the fruits of their industry but also of their good name. In both respects a promising beginning has been made. In the former the press is doing good service; and in the latter, interest proves to be a still better teacher. An association of wine-growers and merchants has been formed, which, supported by the good crops of the last years, has already done considerable damage to the wine-manufacturers. The brewers are also stirring; they demand penal laws to stop the competition of beers made of dye-woods, molasses, quassia, etc.; and the public are already discussing the question whether they could not imitate the example of the Bavarians—i. e., get their beer only where they have reason to believe that they really do get beer. In January, 1877, a great number of the principal chocolate manufacturers entered into a formal and binding agreement not to use substitutions of any kind whatever. The members of the association have adopted a common trade-mark, and their business has not declined, though they have had to increase their prices, while some of the other manufacturers have even lowered theirs. This may, in the end, prove to be the only efficient method of driving the rascals out of the market.

## Correspondence.

### POLITICAL OFFENCES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Will you, for the benefit of your readers, be so good as to define a "political offence," as you understand the term?

Do not the words "political offence," as commonly used, signify an offence committed for the purpose of affecting the distribution of political power, as distinguished from an offence committed for some other purpose, as that of pecuniary gain or of revenge?

I infer from remarks in your paper that the Democratic leaders in Louisiana agreed to condone political offences. If the offences which they thus agreed to condone were not those committed by the Returning Board, what were they?

Boston, February 16, 1878.

Very respectfully,

E. J. L.

[We can recall no case in which the term "political offence" has been made to cover anything but armed resistance, or combinations with a view to armed resistance, to a government on the part of persons owing it allegiance, or riotous or disorderly conduct arising out of hostility to the government or its legislation. We believe the present effort to make it cover the forgery and falsification of legal records by government officers is absolutely novel. This use of it would indeed make Tweed simply a political offender, and put him in the same category with the Carbonari, the Hungarian rebels, the Fenians, and the Cubans, for he stole and forged partly no doubt for purposes of pecuniary gain, but mainly "for the purpose of affecting the distribution of political power." As we point out elsewhere, the Louisiana Legislature said nothing about "political offences." If any one will furnish us with a precedent for the use of the term to cover the offence described in the Louisiana statute, or anything similar, we shall be much obliged to him.—ED. NATION.]



## THE WOODRUFF EXPEDITION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR : I see by the *Nation* of February 14 that my reference to officers of naval practice-ships as the best authorities for the dangers to which youth would be exposed on the Woodruff Expedition has been slightly misconstrued. I did not mean to intimate that a school or training-ship was an exceptionally bad place for young men, but only that naval officers best understood the dangers which might arise from suddenly setting several hundred young men free in a foreign port after months of the ennui of ship life, and the difficulty of keeping them under proper restraint when they went as passengers paying their own way.

NAVY.

## REPUDIATION AND THE SPOILS SYSTEM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR : Two diseases of singular virulence and persistency afflict our body politic—one, the craving to evade the payment of public and private debts ; the other, the passion for obtaining a living at the public expense by the work of controlling votes at popular elections. The long co-existence of the two maladies, for they began their ravages at about the same time, suggests an enquiry into their connection with each other. The struggle for office through politics, which was the first to show itself, broke out immediately upon the inauguration of President Jackson. His policy of removing his opponents and rewarding his friends, continued by his successor, was confirmed as the leading rule of practical politics upon its adoption by the Whig party in 1841. The practice, as yet unshaken, increased in extent and influence with the vast increase of offices which followed the breaking out of the civil war.

The date at which repudiation began is less definitely fixed, and the disease itself is of a varying and intermittent nature. In our business affairs, prosperity, speculative mania, prostration, and slow recovery follow each other with periodic regularity. During the hot fits of speculative activity, when borrowing is easy, repudiation is never heard of. It makes its appearance only with the chill of depression, when payment is hard. The greater part of President Jackson's Administration was a time of apparent prosperity ; but when the crash of 1837 burst the bubble, open repudiation of debts by State governments and the suspension of specie payments made it clear that the disease had taken hold. The shorter and less important crisis of 1857 was followed by some similar but less serious symptoms ; while the great break-down of 1873 has given rise to the widest and deepest manifestation of financial immorality which the country has yet seen, culminating in the scheme of a general reduction of debts by substituting a coin worth ninety cents for a coin worth a hundred.

If the experience of one country for half a century in showing the growth (in the main co-extensive) of these two evils is not enough to prove their necessary connection, let us bring into view the experience of Europe during the same period. In England, in France, in Germany, in all those free countries where no form of repudiation has within fifty years even received the countenance of any political party, the tenure of the great body of civil officers has been independent of changes of government. But when we turn to countries where faith with creditors has not been kept there we inevitably find a partisan civil service. In Spain, for instance, where partial and progressive repudiation is a national policy, we need only read the trustworthy pages of Mr. Wallis's work to learn how dependent all public offices are upon the favor of the supporters of the ministry in the Cortes. And in Greece, where there is no pretence of paying the national debt and public credit is a byword, it is notorious that subordinates in the departments are changed with every change of administration, and that local officials hold their places only on condition that they shall control elections. I do not care to dwell on the fact that the dark lines in our recent history are paralleled only under the worst of the Christian governments of Europe, and it would obviously be unfair to draw Turkey into the comparison, because in Turkey finance and administration have the same object—namely, the plunder of Christians—and the problem is complicated by religious motives, fortunately lacking elsewhere.

A thorough analysis of the two evils would require more space than you could give, but no long process of reasoning is needed to trace both to a common source. What is the spoils system ? It is the system which treats politics as a great national game of mingled skill and chance, in which votes are the pawns to be moved, and popular impulses and public needs the accidents to be taken advantage of ; in which place and power,

honors and profits, are the prizes of the successful players, to be distributed according to the importance of each player's service. The monopoly of executive government is their reward. But alongside the game of politics runs the game of speculation, and here the players know too well how the legislative powers of the government can be used to load the dice. When times are prosperous grants and subsidies are their aim. And when the game is up it is again to the legislature that the losers turn for a diminution of the forfeit. Whatever the cause of the pressure, whether it be the wasteful use of public or of private credit ; whatever the relief sought for, whether it be debasement of the currency, easy bankrupt laws, or open repudiation, it is always legislation which is expected to furnish the remedy.

The two-fold affliction is in truth one and the same disease, manifesting itself in different organs : it is the deep-seated idea that government exists only for the acquirement of power or money by those who know how to grasp and use one of its active powers, the executive or the legislative, as the case may require.

How then shall we treat it ? Has it come to this that we are reduced to consider how far this idea may be put in practice and still allow us to retain under its gradual advance, made slower by resistance, some measure of public credit, some endurable administration of laws ? Or may we look higher, may we reasonably strive for a restoration of government to its legitimate purposes : for the use of its legislative power to maintain individual rights and to protect public interests ; for the administration of its executive duty by officers selected and promoted solely for fidelity and capacity ? The example of other nations teaches us to what level we may fall if we yield to this great moral disease. The history of our own country shows what singular recuperative power we have. Clear brains, skilful hands, patient resolution are needed to lay the knife at the root of the evil ; but, above all, a true and wide-spread understanding of its nature and its danger before it has done its fatal work. B.

BOSTON, February 16, 1878.

## HOW TO MAKE STATES PAY THEIR DEBTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR : In your issue of the 31st ult. you ask, "Can States be Made to Pay their Debts ?" to which the answer given is, Not as matters stand ; but this ought to be changed by the repeal of the Eleventh Amendment, and the consequent restoration of the suability of the States.

I undertake to point out an easier mode : Citizens of New York own millions of dollars of bonds of the State of Tennessee, which are being repudiated. If New York and Tennessee were distinct nations, this injury by the latter to citizens of the former would be a just cause of war. Then New York would owe it to her aggrieved citizens to give them redress by flogging Tennessee into payment of what was due, *plus* the expenses of the war for its collection. Being, however, fellow-members of the United States, New York cannot make war on Tennessee. But none the less does she owe it to her aggrieved citizens to wield her Statehood in their behalf if this can be done. Now it *can* be done, and that effectually.

New York can sue Tennessee in the Supreme Court of the United States. Let her take the Tennessee bonds of her citizens, giving her own in exchange for them, having a longer time to run, the transaction being upon such terms that she cannot in any event lose thereby. Perhaps it would answer for her merely to undertake to collect the Tennessee bonds for a commission. An agent to whom commercial paper is transferred for purposes of collection may sue thereon in his own name. But some arrangement by which New York should sue on the bonds in her own name could easily be made. There would then be no difficulty in New York's obtaining a judgment in the Supreme Court of the United States against Tennessee.

The question remains, How could this judgment be collected ? A judgment against a county or a municipality is collectible by a *mandamus* commanding the corporate authorities to assess and collect a tax to pay off the judgment. In some States—Iowa, for instance—if they neglect to do so the court may compel them by proceedings for contempt, or may constitute the sheriff a special commissioner to assess and collect the tax. By analogy, it is held that, in this state of the law, the Federal courts may, under similar circumstances, constitute the marshal a special commissioner to assess and collect the tax. Now, this mode of proceeding may be made applicable in the case of a judgment against a State.

As the law now stands, the Supreme Court, having rendered the judgment, may compel its payment by a *mandamus* commanding the

Legislature of the State to assess and collect the necessary tax. The States, as to each other and with reference to the jurisdiction over them of the Supreme Court in favor of each other, are simply municipal corporations. Had it not been understood that the jurisdiction of the court involved compulsion to enforce the judgment it was empowered to render against a State in favor of an individual, the resistance thereto which produced the Eleventh Amendment would not have been made. There would have been little objection to a judgment against the State which should stand merely on the footing of a judgment of the Court of Claims, requiring a voluntary appropriation for its payment.

The Legislature of the debtor State could be compelled by *mandamus* to pay off the judgment against it as the law now stands. But Congress might provide that if they did not then the Supreme Court might appoint as many special commissioners as might be needed, not exceeding a given number, to assess and collect a tax throughout the State to pay off the judgment. The law might empower the commissioners to resort to the books of the revenue officers of the State for the basis of the assessment, which would make easy the task of preparing their own books. The tax being assessed, each individual's part of it would be a debt due from him to the creditor State, payment of which might be made enforceable by the process of the court or by suit in the local Federal Court. The details could be easily arranged.

That such legislation would be constitutional there can be no serious doubt. The Constitution vests in the Supreme Court jurisdiction of causes of States against States, and Section 8 of Article I. confers power "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof." A law providing for carrying into execution the judgment which the Supreme Court is empowered to render would, of course, be clearly within the residuary power conferred by the clause just quoted.

If New York would but do her duty to her aggrieved citizens, creditors of Tennessee, the latter State might, without any change in, or addition to, the law as it now stands, be compelled to pay her indebtedness now due these citizens. But with the aid of such a law of Congress as has been suggested the process of collection might be made very plain and effectual.

R. MCP. SMITH.

NASHVILLE, TENN.

#### HOW THE PRESENT DUTIES ON WOOL WERE FIXED.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR : In an article in your last issue entitled "Some Observations on the Proposed New Tariff" you—unintentionally, I have no doubt—do great injustice to the memory of an eminent merchant and manufacturer.

Under the head "Schedule L—Wool and Woollens," you state that

"The classifications of the present tariff are nominally retained, but the existing distinction between clothing and long combing wool is effectually abolished, and both classes, when unwashed, are made subject to a simple duty of 8 cents per pound on wool costing 32 cents and under, and of 10 cents on wool costing over 32 cents per pound. Why this useless distinction should be maintained and allowed to mar the undoubted improvement here proposed it is difficult to explain. The bill also maintains the existing discrimination in favor of English long wools (Class II.), which are allowed to come in *washed* at the single rate of duty, while washed clothing wool has to pay double the rate of unwashed. This discrimination, it is well understood among the trade, was introduced into the tariff of 1867 at the instigation of a prominent New England manufacturer, to whose special benefit it has inured, and who will rub his hands in the grave that now covers him if he learns that his heirs are to continue enjoying the benefit under a reformed tariff."

I was personally conversant with all the circumstances incident to the inception, construction, and enactment of the present wool and woollen tariff, and can assure you that the "New England manufacturer" whose memory you so ruthlessly desecrate had no part in establishing the "discrimination in favor of English long wools" of which you complain. The duties on wools of all classes were determined by the wool-growers, and not by the wool-manufacturers.

You say that it is difficult to explain why a distinction is maintained between clothing wools and long combing wools. It is justified by several practical reasons. I will state one of them : In applying duties to these classes of wools, reference must necessarily be had to the condition in which the wools are usually imported. Wools of the first class are usually imported *unwashed*, and wools of the second class *washed*. In regard to the first class of wools, therefore, it was necessary to make a

provision against an evasion of the duty by washing the wools abroad. The "discrimination" of which you speak is more nominal than real, and was introduced to prevent frauds on the revenue, and not, as you suppose, to favor any class of manufacturers.

Respectfully yours,

E. B. BIGELOW.

BOSTON, February 9, 1878.

[To make the merits of the above-quoted stricture apparent to those of our readers who are not conversant with the origin and operation of our present wool duties, we must enlarge further upon this complicated subject than we were able to do in our late observations on the proposed new tariff.

The Act of March 2, 1867, which remains in force as far as wool is concerned, subjects fine clothing and fine combing wool nominally to the same duties; in reality, however, it establishes a wide distinction between these two classes, by a provision which allows washed combing wool to come in at the simple rate of duty imposed on unwashed wool, while washed clothing wool is made to pay double that rate, and is thereby effectually excluded from our markets. In order to estimate the actual duty on any kind of wool we have to find out what one pound of wool, when cleaned of all impurities, is made to pay. Reduced to this standard the two classes of wool in question now pay the following rates, viz. :

Clothing, from 27 to 46 cts. per lb., equal to about 52 to 100 per cent. ad val.
Combing, from 16 to 17 cts. " " " 43 to 45 " "

To say that such a discrimination is more nominal than real appears to us simply absurd. When Mr. Bigelow says that clothing wools are usually imported unwashed, and combing wools washed, he states a well-known fact; but he mistakes as the cause of the above distinction in our tariff what is in reality its effect. He is not ignorant of the fact that Europe imports a very large proportion of its supply of clothing wool washed and even scoured, while we are prohibited from doing so by the provisions of our tariff; and he will not deny that some of the most useful classes of clothing wool are effectually excluded from our markets, even in the unwashed condition, by those provisions and by those only. What the distinction between clothing and combing wool has to do with the prevention of frauds on the revenue, we are unable to comprehend. Instead of defending it on such untenable grounds Mr. Bigelow might indeed have stated one reason, and the only valid one we can find, for levying a lower *specific* duty on combing than on clothing wool, namely, the lower value of the clean pound of combing when compared with most kinds of clothing wool. Such moderate distinction would result from a uniform ad-valorem duty on all wool, and so far would be just and equitable.

Mr. Bigelow's assertion that the present duties on wool were determined by the wool-growers and not by the manufacturers will find few believers outside of the small circle of specially-favored establishments and among the heavily handicapped consumers of clothing wool. Such may have been the impression when the Act of 1867 was passed, but since then it has long become generally understood that in getting the tariff of 1867 fixed the manufacturers had the lead, and the wool-growers were in tow. What inducement, we ask, could the wool-growers have for asking less protection on combing than on clothing wool, when it is a well-known fact that on this side of the Rocky Mountains long-wool sheep pay the farmer a better interest on his investment than merino sheep? Says an experienced farmer in our State, when reporting to a Boston paper (see *American Cultivator*, January 19, 1878) the discussions of a delegation from the National Association of Wool Manufacturers and of Wool-Growers :

"I do not think it is just and right to give the grower of merino wool an average protection duty of 31½ cents on every pound of scoured wool that he raises, while the growers of Cotswold, Leicester, and other long wools have a protection duty of only 16½ cents on scoured wool."

And further on :

"Our duties discriminate against the very class of sheep and wool which improved agriculture, the demands of trade, and the



wants of meat-eaters alike demand that we should raise and increase as rapidly as possible."

When we are charged with "desecrating the memory" of a deceased manufacturer who undoubtedly profited largely by this unjust discrimination, we admit that it might have been more useful to accuse the living rather than the dead instigators of that transaction; but knowing what we do of his share in it we must decline to acknowledge the injustice of our charge, though the person referred to may not have taken as active a part in the framing of the tariff of 1867 as some others. Here is, in conclusion, what an experienced Massachusetts manufacturer (Mr. Slater) said touching this matter before a meeting of woollen-manufacturers recently held in Boston, as reported in the *Boston Journal of Commerce* of January 12:

"When I hear those who represent second and third-class wool (laughter) I hardly dare trust my lips to reply to them. I do not regard them as honest. They are selfish; they ought to be ashamed to advocate the duty on the raw material which they do. It gives them a protection which is exorbitant, which makes them bloated, and they are completely crushed under its weight."—ED. NATION.]

#### HARVARD EXAMINATIONS FOR WOMEN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: At the request of the Philadelphia local committee on Harvard examinations for women, I published a short article on that subject in the *Penn Monthly Magazine* for December, 1877. It has called forth replies from Col. T. W. Higginson in the *Woman's Journal* of January 12, and from Charles J. Stillé, Esq., in the *Press* of January 30, to which it seems well to say a few words in return. It is the position of these gentlemen rather than their arguments which call for an answer; Col. Higginson, besides his general reputation, enjoying great credit in certain female circles, and Mr. Stillé being provost of the University of Pennsylvania. Much of what they say I must pass over in silence, as it deals with matters of opinion, not of fact. But as they have questioned some of my statements I am bound for the sake of the subject of discussion, and for those for whom I undertook it, to make good what I have asserted.

Most of Col. Higginson's objections arise from careless misinterpretation of what I said. Being limited for space I may have written in too general a manner, and trusted too much to the understanding of all my readers; but it seems to me that the "encouraging response" of which I spoke in the beginning evidently referred to the particular point of university examinations for women, in which it cannot be denied that England set the example. Probably few people in America knew so well as I—even before "the visit of the Amberleys"—how much we were in advance of Englishwomen in our eagerness for education, the degree and variety of our information, the keenness and range of our intellectual interests. I say *were*, for a dozen years have made a great change—for the better with them, for the worse with us. In this direction, as in some others in which we had the start of them, they have gone much further than we. For instance, in the "woman's rights" movement (to use a term which avoids details) the concessions and privileges which have been obtained by our sex in England are at once broader and more solid than those which have been gained in this country. The more rational and enlightened mode of setting to work of the English could not be better exemplified, to my mind, than by the one fact that, while we have covered the face of the country with rival institutions for female education which the whole civilized world could hardly supply with first-rate instruction, they have placed their experiment of Girton under the wing of their great foster-mother of learning, where the daughters really share the advantages of the sons.

Neither was I ignorant that the absence in England of our public-school system, whatever may be thought of its results, and of institutions similar to Vassar, Cornell, etc., was one reason why their female candidates for university certificates so greatly outnumber ours: there are other reasons which I might have given if I had been writing on both sides of the question, but they do not alter my opinion that our paucity is discreditable. Granting that Harvard is surpassed by Vassar in mathematics, Cornell in Greek, Michigan in chemistry, are women to go to Vassar, Cornell, Michigan, all three, to get an education? At Vassar, according to my latest advices, a year ago they could get no Greek at all, and very little geometry. But I supposed that the superiority of Harvard to all other schools in the country, even upon the whole to Yale, was admitted. In speaking of its long record I naturally meant the

record of its fame, not of its age. If this superiority be not admitted, I refer those who dispute it to the sources whence I drew my own information, which are open to everybody, viz.—the circulars of the different universities and colleges, with the courses of study and lists of professors, and the catalogues of their graduates (to prevent further mistake, let me say that I allude not merely to their numbers but their standing), and to the papers of the Harvard female preliminary examinations for 1877. There is not room in ordinary magazine and newspaper articles for these tabular and statistical comparisons.

Mr. Stillé begins his "careful and candid examination of the scheme" of Harvard female examinations by saying: "The preliminary course need not detain us. At the advanced examination the candidate is permitted to choose subjects from one of five great divisions, viz.: First, languages; second, physical science; third, mathematics; fourth, history; fifth, philosophy; and, if she satisfies the examiners by her answers on *any one of these subjects*, she is entitled to a certificate." Now, it will be shown that the preliminary examination, which is dismissed as of no moment, is but little below the standard of a complete education at the University of Pennsylvania, carrying the candidate in some directions as far as the Junior class, in others as far as the Senior. It is not possible to give parallel tables of the courses, because, for instance, English at our University covers history and literature, while in the Harvard examinations for women they are separate studies—the latter necessitating a thorough and philosophical knowledge of history, ancient and modern, European and American, religious and secular, while the English required of the Junior class is only Green's 'History of the English People.' International Law and social science do not form part of the female course, as they do in the Senior class of the University of Pennsylvania; but Shakspeare does not appear in the curriculum of the latter, and Taine's 'English Literature,' which is the manual of the Seniors, does not enable a student to answer the questions of the Harvard examinations. To take another branch, physics, the Senior course requires no more acquaintance with the subject than the Harvard female examination papers, except where it enters the region of astronomy, which is fully compensated by the severe course of physical geography in the Harvard preliminary examinations—a study not belonging to the college course of the University of Pennsylvania. Latin, German, and French were included in the Harvard preliminary work last year. In 1878 Greek is added, and is elective with Latin or German. The Greek course consists of four books of Xenophon's 'Anabasis' and the first book of the 'Iliad,' which is more advanced than the Greek required at the University of Pennsylvania, and about equal to what is taken as an elective study in the Senior year. Latin becomes elective with French in the Junior year. Their highest course of French is far behind that of the Harvard preliminary examinations. The German of the Junior class (also elective) is on a par with it. Let us see what Latin is actually required by our University: of the Freshmen, "Selections from Livy and Horace's Satires, with Professor's Syllabus"; of the Sophomores, one of Tacitus's histories, one of Cicero's orations, a selection from Horace's odes, with syllabus of metres! After this it becomes elective. The female candidates for the Harvard preliminary examinations last June passed a thorough exercise in Latin grammar, translated from Latin into English and *vice versa*, and were questioned on Virgil ('Æneid'), Phædrus, Justin, Cornelius Nepos, Roman history, and geography. The seven branches of the preliminary examination must be passed before the candidate can take any one of the five divisions of the advanced examinations; therefore everybody can perceive the want of candor in omitting it from a discussion of the subject. A young woman who has passed satisfactorily in history, English literature, physical geography, botany or physics (which are in future to be elective with each other), arithmetic, algebra through quadratic equations, plane geometry, and French, German, Greek, or Latin, is in all those branches, except the classics and mathematics, much beyond the point at which the student of the University of Pennsylvania begins his elective studies. The advanced examination in any of its divisions is above the level of the Senior course, required or elective.

To return to the standing of Harvard, to which Mr. Stillé frequently recurs: it certainly settles the question, at least between her claims and those of the University of Pennsylvania, that the Senior course of the latter, including the elective branches, with the sole exception of German, must be completed to take the student over the ground covered by the Freshman year of the former, which in addition includes chemistry, a study not forming part of the academic course of our University. Philosophy and English are Senior studies of the latter not taken by the Harvard Fresh-

man, as they belong to his later courses; but the inexorable fact remains that in the classics, modern languages, and mathematics the Harvard student enters the Sophomore class at the point the graduate of the University of Pennsylvania takes his diploma—"the test of culture" of this institution. Those who doubt can verify for themselves by consulting the catalogues of the two colleges. The reputation of Harvard, however undeserved or contested, is to be gauged by comparing the number of her undergraduates last year with those of some sister universities: Harvard, 813; Yale, 582; Princeton, 451; University of Pennsylvania, 131.

Just a year before the publication of my article in the *Penn Monthly* for December, an appeal was made to our University, through the provost, to confer certificates on women by the same plan as that of Harvard, which was refused. Those interested in promoting female education then applied to Harvard to extend her examinations to Philadelphia, which was granted. There are now classes in history, chemistry, and physics open to women at the University of Pennsylvania. This is a wise and generous step which we hope will meet with recognition on the part of our women. But it is absurd to claim that even all three branches constitute a course approaching that of the Harvard preliminary examinations, not to speak of the advanced ones. There are, moreover, serious obstacles to the usefulness of this measure; the distance of our University from the main city of Philadelphia and from its most important suburbs is a difficulty in the attendance even of male students; and many persons, especially the parents of girls, object to a system of co-education. Mr. Stillé's statement that chemistry, physics, and botany cannot be studied accurately and thoroughly at home will be denied by many men who have distinguished themselves in those sciences; his assertion, that only "the most elementary part" of a language can be acquired by private tuition, is absolutely contradicted by the experience of the most intelligent tutors and students of languages. He claims to have proved that preparation for the examinations by private instruction is impossible; this can neither be proved nor disproved with regard to the advanced examinations until next June, as hitherto nobody has taken that course, although a number of candidates are now preparing for it in that manner; at the preliminary examinations held in New York last year one of the three who passed in the entire course without conditions had been prepared exclusively at home and alone.

In conclusion, I wish to say that it would ill become me, as a woman, to discourage the experiment of female colleges or co-education, and as a Philadelphian to decry the University of Pennsylvania, and I have not meant to do either. But as my statements were attacked, it was incumbent upon me to confirm them; having done so, should my articles be honored with further notice, there will be no rejoinder.

SARAH B. WISTER.

PHILADELPHIA, February 4, 1878.

## Notes.

THE war correspondent of the *Times* in Asia Minor, Mr. C. B. Norman, gives his observations of the obscure military events in that quarter in a volume, 'Armenia and the Campaign of 1877,' to be published next month by Cassell, Petter & Galpin.—G. P. Putnam's Sons will shortly begin a series of volumes called 'Current Discussions,' made up of "essays of special note and permanent importance upon the questions of the time that have been recently contributed to leading English periodicals." The essays will be grouped by subjects, each volume being devoted to a single one. Mr. Edward C. Burlingame will be the editor.—A new work on the successful American Communities, with all the information needed by those who wish to join them, is in preparation at the Oneida Community. The author is Mr. Wm. Alfred Hinds.—A. S. Barnes & Co. announce that the first volume of the *Magazine of American History* is very scarce, but that they will endeavor to procure it for subscribers to the succeeding issues.—The March number of the *Popular Science Monthly* will contain an article by Mr. E. R. Leland, on the "Debasement of Coinages," that promises to have a timely interest.—The Philadelphia *Ledger* calls attention to the pending offer by M. Rochambeau to sell our National Library, for a moderate price, the important collection of papers left by his ancestor, our Revolutionary ally, Count Rochambeau. Like other urgent subjects for legislation by the present Congress, its consideration has been postponed by the silver controversy. We hope its ultimate acceptance is not doubtful.—Porter & Coates, Philadelphia, will soon issue Macaulay's 'History of England,' in five volumes 12mo,

from new electrotype plates from the last English edition.—Mr. Frederick Martin's 'Statesman's Year-book' for 1878 comes to us with its usual punctuality from Macmillan & Co. This unrivalled manual is designed to represent the normal constitution and condition of civilized countries, and hence does not generally take account of political complications or reflect passing events. In the case of Turkey, however, the section on the military forces has been entirely rewritten, and there are several allusions to the war now in progress, as, *e.g.*, p. 467: "It was reported at the commencement of the Russian war that 'the printing of "caim's" [paper money] is going on uninterruptedly, and new presses are put to work, to issue them in larger numbers than before.' According to reliable estimates, more than twenty millions sterling of paper money had been issued by the end of November, 1877." Considerable additions have been made also to the bibliography of Turkey, but here, as in the case of the United States and of other countries, the editor does not show either as much knowledge or discrimination as would be desirable.—Dr. Paul Topinard's excellent compendium of Anthropology, which first appeared in the Reinwald series called "Bibliothèque des Sciences Contemporaines," has been translated, like the other volumes in the same series, for the benefit of English readers, and is now published in this country by J. B. Lippincott & Co. It has a good index.—The new American Art Association will open an exhibition at the Kurtz Gallery on the 3d prox.; this society represents the younger artists who have been studying under European masters. At an inaugural dinner on the 16th inst., expressions of sympathy for the new movement were elicited from Judge Noah Davis, Mr. August Belmont, the Rev. Doctors Alger and Bellows, Mr. Clark Bell, and others.

—The *Galaxy's* legacy to the *Atlantic* for March is a (now posthumous) paper by ex-Secretary Welles on "The Opposition to Lincoln in 1864." It is but a disjointed production, which only half fulfils the promise of the title. Mr. Welles once more holds up to public scorn the Radicals who opposed Mr. Lincoln's initiation of reconstruction, on the basis of the proclamation of December 8, 1863, and once more fails to perceive the logical outgrowth of the carpet-bag régime from that identical basis. If this régime was an attempt to keep society standing on its apex, Mr. Lincoln seems to us first to have placed it there by recognizing one-tenth of the Presidential voters in 1860 as the government of any given State in process of restoration. The rest of the paper is an attack on Grant's military capacity. Mr. Longfellow contributes to this number a poem called "The White Czar," and "Another Rosary of Sonnets," among which those dedicated to the Two Rivers show a noticeable reminiscence of Wordsworth. In calling midnight

"The Watershed of Time, from which the streams  
Of Yesterday and To-morrow take their way,"

the poet disregards the scientific distinction between "watershed" and "divide," with some loss of sharpness in the image. Mr. Bishop's story of "Detmold," which opened in a fresh and taking manner, already appeared to us to drag in its third instalment; and now, in its fourth, with the conclusion only dimly and distantly foreshadowed, certainly calls for a change of title. "Verona, an architectural romance," suggests itself. We fear that Mr. Bishop's mission to deliver himself on the subject of art weighs upon him much more powerfully than the secret of Alice's and Detmold's fate, locked up as yet in his bosom alone. Like George Eliot, too, he prefers philosophizing to action, and this makes one prepared for indefinite protraction of a drama whose unity of time and place is so rigorously maintained.

—Mr. Edward King's second paper on the Russians in Bulgaria, in the March *Lippincott's*, is less interesting than the first, because it consists to a much larger extent of hearsay and less of personal observation. It is, however, worth reading; and so, among the other articles, is an eyewitness's account of the taking of Fort Fisher. The writer was on board the new *Ironsides* throughout the bombardment, overlooked from the maintop the assault by our land forces, and visited the fort after its capture. His descriptions are clear and graphic, and ought to make recruits for the peace society. In *Harper's*, Mrs. Lamb's "State and Society in Washington" conveys a good deal of curious information about the State Department building, and asserts that "our capital is the seat of the most refined and polished society in America." This will doubtless be contested by other capitals; and, with the most perfect agreement as to the definition of terms, there would still be an obvious need of wide and intimate experience to justify disputants in espousing either one side or the other. Mr. C. F. Thwing's article on "Summer Schools" is valuable for reference as to the origin and present number and variety



of these praiseworthy institutions, of recent growth. It even contains announcements for the coming summer. Both the foregoing papers are liberally illustrated, and this is the case also with Mr. Edward Abbott's "Grand Manan and Quoddy Bay," which, so far as our experience goes, does rather less than justice to the peculiar and fantastic charm of the waters which wash our easternmost limits. The constant mirage which robs the outlines of mainland and islands of all fixity, and dissolves them into a thousand unrecognizable and unsubstantial shapes, is barely suggested. But Mr. Abbott is wholly right in recommending summer tourists to seek these almost virgin resorts. He might, by the way, in quoting from Longfellow's "Evangeline," have mentioned the supposed identity of *Quoddy and Acadie*.

—The *Portfolio* (J. W. Bouton) has lately been gratifying its subscribers with numbers almost exclusively written by the editor, for whose easy, "self-reading" articles no acceptable substitute has ever been found. Some of these, anonymous or incognito, are distinguished by the frank editorial "I," whose presence in an unsigned paper can have but one intent. We observe Mr. Hamerton in error, however, with a statement (sifted by us before, we think) that no exhibited pictures of Meissonier's with woman for a subject are known. The example in the gallery of the late A. T. Stewart, representing a beggar-woman asking alms of a chasseur, may not have been exhibited within the *Portfolio's* ken; but the portrait of Mme. Henri Thénard attracted much attention in the Salon of 1861 and at the Universal Exposition. A welcome present to the January purchasers was Whistler's wholly admirable etching of "Billingsgate." In the same number, apropos of some woodcuts which are really taken from Mr. Clarence Cook's "House Beautiful," the writer observes that "protest must really be entered against the mode of placing ornaments upon the mantel and shelves which, as here depicted, may be considered to be held up as a model; in four out of five illustrations plates, fans, Venice glass, vases, candlesticks, are scattered in hopeless confusion and mutual enmity." The February number is as richly illustrated as that for January, with two extremely interesting etchings, several cuts, and a Durand heliograph. The Turner papers are continued in both, but these are now becoming too indicial—if there be such a word—giving us the page of the catalogue or index, when what we want is the thought which plays around the lines of the catalogue when Mr. Hamerton reads them.

—The most striking paper in the sixty-ninth number of the Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society is that entitled "Dr. Le Plongeon in Yucatan." The sum and substance of it seems to be that Dr. Aug. Le Plongeon unearthed while at Chichen-Itza, in Yucatan, a big statue representing a reclining person, which was "admirably worked" and a "gem of art." On this "find" Dr. Le Plongeon unsuccessfully endeavored to base a title to appointment as Mexican Commissioner to the Philadelphia Exhibition of 1876. He now attaches to it a host of speculations and scientifically-worded reasonings, taking a number of things for granted which are as yet far from being so. Of course the alphabet of Landa is to him a sacred truth, but he goes still further and establishes a chronology exceeding in length that of China or Japan. He also shows himself much more proficient than any of his predecessors in the "reading" of didactic pictures. His interpretations of long files of these (done *after restoration by himself*) are achieved with the greatest ease and rapidity. How far his results are reliable we leave archaeologists to decide. The Society itself discreetly remains non-committal on the question, and thus, while avoiding the disagreeable responsibility of supporting the outbursts of extravagant enthusiasm, secures the credit of introducing to the scientific world archaeological discoveries important enough in themselves without the encumbrance of fantastical views.

—The members of the U. S. Entomological Commission have had a protracted meeting in Washington, preparing their first report for the printer. This commission consists of Professors C. V. Riley, of St. Louis, Mo.; A. S. Packard, jr., of Salem, Mass., and Cyrus Thomas, of Carbondale, Ill., and was created primarily to investigate and report on the Rocky Mountain locust or grasshopper, with a view of counteracting its injuries and preventing its disastrous invasions. A review of their field labors during the past season and a synopsis of the report have been submitted to the Secretary of the Interior, and show that the work has been thorough and satisfactory. The report will contain between four and five hundred pages, and will be amply illustrated with plates, maps, and wood-cuts. The principal chapters are devoted to the practical phase of the subject, and it is clearly shown how to manage successfully the young insects as they hatch out in the more fertile country beyond

the Mississippi, while the way is pointed out to prevent the invasions of the mature insects into the same country. The commission appeared before the Appropriation Committee of the House and asked for an appropriation of \$25,000 to complete the investigation, admitting frankly that there were yet some important questions which, for want of sufficient time and funds, it had been impossible fully to settle. With the sum asked for they pledge themselves to complete the special investigation, so as to obviate in future the necessity of appointing a similar commission, and, in addition, to study and report on the cotton-worm of the South, with a view of saving the loss it inflicts. As might have been expected from the standing of the commissioners, their labors have been conscientious and fruitful beyond the most sanguine expectations, and when we consider the vast importance of the grasshopper and cotton-worm problem the appropriation asked for seems reasonable.

—All scholars who have investigated the vocalism of the earliest literary period of the French language recognize the importance of the assonances or vocal rhymes of the poems of this period and employ them in their linguistic researches. The most extensive assonant poem of this period, the "Chanson de Roland," as it is preserved in the Oxford MS., exhibits the greatest faults in its assonances. This is quite natural, as it is only an Anglo-Norman copy of the original poem written in the eleventh century in continental France. Mr. Adolf Rambaud, in a dissertation for his doctor's degree ('Ueber die als echt nachweisbaren Assonanzen des Oxford Textes der Chanson de Roland,' Marburg, 1877), has compared the Oxford text with all the other numerous MSS. and redactions of the "Chanson de Roland," and has shown that they all, directly or indirectly, rest upon one common original, which must be, for the most part, the work of the poet himself. He gives a sure principle by which the genuine assonance may be known. These reveal the state of vocalism in the eleventh century, and prove that the medley of contradictory dialectic forms which appear in the MSS. is due to the ignorance of the copyists. The comparison of the genuine assonances of the "Chanson de Roland" with the "Cantilène de Ste. Eulalie" and the poems of St. Leger and St. Alexis proves that the vocalism of these poems does not present any dialectical difference from that of the "Chanson de Roland," but only shows a different state of development as regards the time, while the vocalism of the poem in the Oxford text is the same as that of other Anglo-Norman poems of the same date, as, e.g., those of Philip de Thaurin. The importance of the principles elucidated in the dissertation for the correct reconstruction of the original text is very great, and so the dissertation (which is only the introduction to a larger work soon to be published) has a literary as well as a philological value.

—The last numbers of the *Romania* and *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* complete the sixth year of the former and the first of the latter, and afford an opportunity to compare these friendly rivals. The present number of the *Romania* contains a miscellaneous contribution from P. Meyer: "Mélanges de poésie française." Among the four poems mentioned is a fragment of one on the first Crusade recently discovered in the binding of a book bought in London. A fac-simile shows that the writing is French of the thirteenth century, and reveals the nationality of the hitherto unknown author. A. Morel-Fatio notices a MS. of the fourteenth century containing a fragment of the original Old-Catalan version of Raymond Lully's celebrated "Roman de Blaquerne," and E. Cosquin continues his "Contes populaires lorrains." These stories have reached the number of thirty-one and are doubly valuable to students of folk-lore from the extensive notes of the learned editor, who shows himself a worthy follower of Liebrecht and Köhler. The remainder of the number is made up of philological miscellanies and book reviews. In the *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* A. Stimming concludes his study of the syntax of Commynes, and remarks that so far as phonetics and inflexion are concerned Commynes is substantially modern; but in his syntax he follows the Old-French usage. U. A. Canello furnishes an article on the Italian tonic vocalism, in which he only treats of the long accented E, reserving the remainder of his study for another occasion. A. Weber communicates two inédited versions of the Theophilus legend. The first is a Latin poem (in accented iambic trimeter) of the fourteenth century from the Paris National Library, the second is an Old-French metrical version from the Egerton MS. 612 of the British Museum. Both are of interest for this wide-spread legend of the forerunner of Dr. Faust. In the department of *Miscellen* H. Varnhagen notices the MS. acquisitions of the British Museum, from 1865-1877, in the field of Old-Romance literature. The number of MSS. mentioned is fourteen for Old-French and thirteen for Old-Italian, among the latter a prose

version of the Seven Wise Masters differing somewhat from those already known. There are, besides, the usual number of text-criticisms and etymological studies. The bibliography which formed so important a feature of the *Jahrbuch für romanische Literatur* is to be issued separately, owing to the lack of space in the *Zeitschrift*. We must not omit mention of an important feature of this number, and one which deserves to be imitated in all similar journals, we mean the three indexes of the volume—one of subjects, one of passages cited, and one of words. The latter facilitates reference to the important department of etymologies. Both journals deserve the highest praise; the *Zeitschrift* is a worthy successor of the *Jahrbuch*, and the *Romania* is worthy of a country that has produced a Sainte-Pelaye and a Raynouard.

#### GENERAL LEE AND HIS ARMY.\*

THIS book is a disappointment. To say so is to say the worst that can fairly be said of it, but it is unfortunately true. General Lee is one of the prominent characters of American history. The story of his life and the question of the place which he should occupy on the steps of fame are matters of interest to all Americans, on whichever side they may have ranged themselves in our civil war. The South regards him as the greatest commander in our war, and Colonel Taylor calls him the first man of his day and generation. Colonel Chesney says that his campaigns "placed the name of Lee in the very foremost rank of the world's great commanders." We at the North, knowing some of us more about the nature of the struggle than any Englishman can, and viewing the question naturally from a different point from our brethren at the South, hesitate to admit so much. We remember his failure to attack after our repulse at Fredericksburg; we doubt the wisdom of his action at Chancellorsville, glorious to him and disgraceful to Hooker as was the result of that bold enterprise; and we cannot forget how he wrecked his army at Gettysburg. But, all deductions made, enough remains to leave us proud of him as an American soldier, and, but for the doubts which linger as to his responsibility for the treatment of our prisoners, we incline to be equally proud of him as a man. We would gladly know more of him, as a soldier and as a man, and Colonel Taylor's book raised expectation to a high point. He had a right to call his book 'Four Years with General Lee,' for it was his "peculiar privilege to occupy the position of a confidential staff-officer with General Lee during the entire period of the War for Southern Independence." He led us to expect a book that should be at the same time most valuable and most interesting. If it be true, as a clever Frenchman has said, that "interest is the lowest of literary pleasures," an exception may surely be made in favor of biographies, and especially of the biographies of very conspicuous persons. We expect such books to be interesting, and when they fail to be so we are disappointed, and we think we have a right to be so. It is hard to believe that a confidential staff-officer of General Lee should have put together two hundred large and closely-printed pages, covering the whole period of the war, and yet have told us so little of General Lee. If the author has erred, as we think he has, it has been not from carelessness or want of industry, but, as it seems to us, from an error of judgment, or a want of perception of the true use to make of the material which he must have possessed. There are scraps of information which we believe to be quite new and which are full of interest, but there are only enough of them to make us long for more. Pains-taking, candid, and straightforward as Colonel Taylor appears to have been, he has left unsaid much which he ought to have said. In the latter half of the book he introduces extracts from his diary, beginning in October, 1863, and these we read with delighted interest, and only wish that he had begun to do so earlier and had done so more.

In so far as the book is "a summary of the more important events touching the career of General Robert E. Lee," it does not add materially to our previous stock of knowledge, and does not seem to show that Colonel Taylor's experiences had developed in him a very sound military judgment. He thinks that if Stuart had not prematurely, before the infantry was up, opened fire from a few guns posted on high ground on our forces assembled near Harrison's Landing, at the end of the Seven Days, and so called our attention to the importance of the position, General Lee would have "made sure of this naturally strong line, fortified it well, maintained it against assault, and dictated to General McClellan terms of

surrender." General McClellan was sluggish in posting his army on its arrival at Harrison's Landing, and there was a good deal of confusion on that day of dismal rain and mud; but not even Stuart's guns arrived that day, and the next day the weather was perfect and the army was in very fair order, and to those who remember the "lay of the land" about the Evelington hills, the heights of which Colonel Taylor speaks, and how much easier it was for us to seize and hold them than for Lee; who remember how powerful our army was and how elated by the result of Malvern Hill, fought two days before, and, above all, who bear in mind what was the condition of Lee's army on the morning after Malvern Hill ("the whole army," General Trimble says, in his official report, "in the utmost disorder, thousands of straggling men asking every passer-by for their regiments—presenting a scene of the most woful and disheartening confusion"), the suggestion that Lee, twenty-four hours after, could have taken such action as would have enabled him to dictate terms of surrender to McClellan, who had reached his supplies and had the guns afloat to help him, is one that can only provoke a smile. The idea is seen to be the more preposterous when we read Colonel Taylor's estimate, on p. 56, that Lee, with sixty-two thousand men, was pursuing McClellan, with eighty-five or ninety thousand.

We are surprised, too, to find Colonel Taylor declaring, at this late day, that "considerable delay was occasioned in the pursuit from the fact that the ground was unknown to the Confederate commanders." Lee's army was full of Virginians; the operations of the Seven Days were conducted, as it were, within sight of Richmond. One of the great places of Virginia, the Selden place, if we remember rightly, was within the ground occupied by McClellan in his encampment on the James, and, finally, there was with Lee's army a company of the Fifteenth Virginia Regiment, called the Henrico Light Guards, made up presumably altogether and certainly in part of men who lived near Malvern Hill and knew the country intimately. Under these circumstances, if the Confederate commanders were ignorant of the ground, it was their fault and not their misfortune.

It does not raise one's respect for a military writer to find him ready to endorse, so far as citation endorses, an absurdly exaggerated statement. He quotes from A. P. Hill's report of his repulse of a Union force sent across the Potomac to harass the Confederate rear-guard after the battle of the Antietam: "By their own account, they lost three thousand men killed and drowned from one brigade alone." Who gave that account? What Union brigade ever went into action three thousand strong? Was every man in a force of three thousand men ever destroyed in a day?

Colonel Taylor seems to think that Pickett's magnificent charge at Gettysburg actually carried the position, and that the Confederates failed to win a complete victory only because Pickett was not properly supported. Such an illusion might have been pardonable a dozen years ago, but time and the full information it has brought should have taught him better. He speaks of "entering the works of the enemy," of "leaping the breastworks," of "gathering the fruits of a victory so nobly won," and of "resisting all efforts of the enemy to dislodge them." This is certainly visionary so far as it relates to what was done, and almost certainly visionary so far as it relates to what might have been done if Lee had ordered and his men had obeyed otherwise than as they did. It is as nearly as possible true that we had no "works" and no "breastworks" at Gettysburg on the part of the line which Pickett attempted to carry. Space does not suffice here for a full description of the exceedingly slight turning of earth which some of our men had accomplished, loosening the earth with bayonets, and throwing it up with a broken canteen. As little foundation is there for the pretence that a victory was won. In our opinion Pickett's advance was one of the most magnificent feats of arms recorded in history, but it failed. No "organized body" entered our works. There were no works there to enter, and only a very few gallant men succeeded in piercing the line and getting in among the guns which were placed behind an opening in the fence or wall which ran along the front of our position. We believe it to be reasonably certain, too, that if, as Colonel Taylor suggests, "the veteran divisions of Hood and McLaws had been moved forward, as was planned, in support of those of Pickett and Pettigrew," the result he pictures would not have followed: "Not only would the latter division, in all probability, have gained the enemy's works, as did that of Pickett, but these two would have been enabled, with the aid of Hood and McLaws, to resist all efforts of the enemy to dislodge them." But this is not the place for fighting the battle of Gettysburg over again, and we must pass to a brief consideration of what is really the most important part of Colonel Taylor's book—to wit: his

\* *Four Years with General Lee: Being a Summary of the More Important Events touching the Career of General Robert E. Lee, in the War between the States; together with an Authoritative Statement of the Strength of the Army which he Commanded in the Field.* By Walter H. Taylor, of his Staff, and late Adjutant-General of the Army of Northern Virginia. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1877.



"authoritative statement" of the strength of the army which Lee commanded in the field.

We believe Colonel Taylor to be a thoroughly honest man, and that he has not only meant to tell the truth, but that he has taken great pains to ascertain the truth, and that he believes he has succeeded. We believe that he is mistaken. We believe that he is, quite unconsciously to himself, too ardent a partisan to deal successfully with his difficult subject, and we believe that what we have written about his book gives color, at least, to this belief. There is a great deal of minute detail as to numbers given by him, and his results have an air of authenticity, and yet we are confident that he has made many and grave mistakes. To criticise this portion of his book as it must be criticised to do it full justice would be a work of great labor, and one for which we have no special fitness. We never served in the Adjutant-General's department, and never had to do personally with any larger return of men than a brigade morning report; but when we are told that the Confederates at the Antietam "had from first to last less than fourteen thousand men" on their left flank, we simply say we do not believe it. There is a mistake somewhere. The corps of Hooker, Mansfield, and Sumner attacked this force, the ground was reasonably open, the engagement was short, and yet these three corps lost (including the few lost by Hooker in his movements of the preceding evening) nearly nine thousand men in killed and wounded, not counting the missing. These men did not run away. They gained a little ground from the enemy. They were not raw troops. They had learned to shoot as well as stand up and be shot at. However it may seem to others, the statement that this force, numbering some forty thousand men, not storming entrenchments nor much exposed to artillery fire, not routed and pursued, but upon the whole gaining ground from the enemy, had some nine thousand of its number killed and wounded by an opposing force of fourteen thousand, seems to us simply incredible.

Another reason for dissatisfaction with Colonel Taylor's statement of numbers is that he frequently takes them from published reports of general officers, and that he seems to have preserved no memoranda of the morning reports of Lee's army, which he probably received nearly every day. How far the "informal return" of the strength of the Southern army near Richmond May 31, 1862, or the "field and monthly reports of the Department of Northern Virginia," which he found in the archive-office of the War Department at Washington, take the place of morning reports, we are not competent to judge.

This question of the comparative strength of the Army of the Potomac and of the Army of Northern Virginia in their various engagements is one of great interest, and it is not answered yet. The man who answers it must be not only a diligent student and a careful and candid man, but he must have much knowledge that can only be gained in service. We incline to the opinion that when the truth comes to be fully known, it will appear that the Confederates far exceeded the Federals in the percentage of the number reported present which they habitually took into action. What with our sick in quarters and in regimental and field hospitals, and our lavish details for extra duty, our orderlies and company cooks, our wagoners and hospital nurses, and our large gangs about the quartermaster's and commissary's depots, our number reported present was apt to be far in excess of the numbers which went into action. Few colonels ever saw a line formed for dress-parade which corresponded to their morning report. The Army of Northern Virginia fought wonderfully, whether it was the excellence of the leaders, or of the men, or of both; and few know it so well as the members of the Army of the Potomac. We did require largely superior numbers to beat them, and we know it; but we are not ready to admit that fourteen of them were a match for forty of us. On the contrary, we think we have proved, over and over again, that when we were even tolerably managed we could meet them on very even terms. It has been well said that the general result of the fighting between these two armies was that the assailant was repulsed. Their merit was so equal that the advantage of position could not be overcome by the enthusiasm of attack. At Fair Oaks, their whole army, so far as they chose to use it, attacked four divisions of ours, with no advantage of position on our side, and we beat them off with the aid of a fifth small division at the finish. At Gaines's Mill, McClellan allowed Porter to be overwhelmed by largely superior forces of the enemy, while the bulk of his army listened to the firing from behind the fortified lines which he had kept them building for a month, to make no use of them when the day came for using them. At Malvern Hill, a small part of our army handled very roughly as many men as they saw fit to send against us. At Nelson's Farm, according to the best information attainable, a superior force of Confederates failed to

drive an inferior force of Federals from a position that had no strength of its own. At Fredericksburg, we attacked them just as they wished to have us, and they repulsed us easily. Chancellorsville was a great victory of Lee over Hooker, and not of his army over ours. At Gettysburg they attacked in several places for three days, and were obliged to draw off at the last. After Gettysburg the warfare became one of constant attack and defence of positions, and they had practically always the interior line. Antietam was a drawn battle, except that for an invader not to succeed is to fail.

Our remarks upon this book have extended to very considerable length, for the reason that its subject is most interesting, and its author a man of character and one whose position entitles his work to respectful attention. We believe that he has not exhausted the subject which furnishes the most important part of his book, but that he has done much to aid the future enquirer.

#### FREEMAN'S ARCHITECTURAL SKETCHES.\*

TO no subject can Schiller's well-known distich be more truly applied than to Architecture:

"Einem ist sie die hohe, die himmlische Göttin, dem Andern  
Eine tüchtige Kuh, die ihn mit Butter versorgt."

But Mr. Freeman holds her in a middle place. To him she is the handmaid of history, and one of the most trustworthy. He, indeed, began his historical labors with a "History of Architecture," which his present volume leads us to believe he has done wisely in not republishing since he became famous. The little book of Sketches, coming from so eminent a hand, might be expected to show a competent knowledge of the subject to which it is mainly devoted. But we do not always find what we have a right to expect, and Mr. Freeman's Sketches, so far as they are architectural, might tempt one to believe that he had perpetrated an elaborate and somewhat pedantic hoax, and that he desired to ridicule the musings of a learned though desultory mind on a professional subject of which it had but a comparatively superficial knowledge. The wandering of the attention from the theme under consideration, the rarity of original thought upon the monuments discussed, and, when it is put forth, the exaggerated importance attributed to minor points, finally the author's drawings—all appear a characteristic parody of the dilettante; perhaps, indeed, somewhat caricatured by the so-called "illustrations."

The rambling remarks suggested by the historic associations of the cities visited are serious enough, however; we are newly astonished at Mr. Freeman's enormous capacity for facts, and at his confident insight into the significance of political events and transmutations. He truly says: "The man who tries to fix the dates of buildings without knowing what the dates mean—that is, without knowing what the state of things was when the buildings were set up—can never reach to an accurate understanding of his own special walk." To speak of the historical elements of the book is not our present object; that but few exceptions can be taken to Mr. Freeman's accuracy when on his own ground all will understand who are familiar with his previous writings, but there is a tendency to repetition and to exaggeration which betrays the haste with which these essays were originally written, and the want of adequate remodeling before their present republication. It is evident that Mr. Freeman has given considerable attention to architecture, considerable study to the great stone book in which some nations have written their only chronicles now remaining to the historian, but it cannot be said that his reflections thereon are to be accepted without reserve. He supposes himself to have made one discovery to which he frequently calls attention; it is the ground-tone of the book, and must be admitted to differ from any opinion of the history of architectural development hitherto proposed or received. "The age of Diocletian," he maintains, "the age which reared the court of Spalato, though its bricks may be wider apart than bricks were in the golden age of Nero, is seen to be the age of the greatest architectural development the world ever saw." That is to say, the years A.D. 305-310, a period one would least expect to find chosen for such an honor, a date midway between the building of the Pantheon and of the St. Sophia, the longest and dreariest blank in the history of architecture. He has coined a new name for the Roman manner before its decadence, viz.: "pre-Spalatine," and he asserts that, "next to the introduction of the arch itself, the greatest invention in the history of architecture was the improvement by which the architect of Diocletian's palace at Spalato ventured to make an arch spring at once from the capitals of a pair of columns." (By "pair of

\* "Historical and Architectural Sketches, chiefly Italian." By Edward A. Freeman, D.C.L., LL.D., etc. With twenty-two illustrations from drawings by the Author. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 12mo, pp. vii.-315.

columns" Mr. Freeman does not mean coupled columns, as the term usually implies; his exact purport must often be read between the lines.) This invention, if such it is to be called, was certainly no sudden or isolated venture. It is adopted in many structures of that period, and instances of its previous appearance are known. Arches had sprung directly from the capitals of antæ and pilasters since the time of their first introduction, and the substitution of pillar for pilaster lies near at hand. Nor was it, indeed, an immediate advance. Diocletian's architect himself does not seem to have considered it a betterment, for in this upper arcade he replaced the representative entablature, probably not imagining that the omission of it below would be pronounced the greatest improvement the world ever saw. The fact is, arch and column are not well agreed; an archivolt upon Ionic or Corinthian capitals is a weakly-curved architrave. An arch demands of columns functions for which they are not adapted, they being by their nature prepared to resist vertical pressure only. The delicate abacus cannot ideally withstand a side thrust; the interlocation of the stilt, as an impost, mediates, and, far from being cast off in post-Spalatine architecture, continually appears in the best examples where these dissonant features are combined. It is only when the imposed mass is very light, as at Spalato, that the arch can securely spring from the classical abacus. Yet, however distorted by our writer, an element of truth remains. It is true that in the beginning of the fourth century the lintel, the horizontal line of the Greeks, began to lose somewhat of its evil influence over the Roman arch. The entablature was shuffled off, rather by time than by the ability of Diocletian's architect, and the weary groping after the proper support for the arch began.

Mr. Freeman rightly insists upon the continuity of architecture as parallel to the continuity of history inculcated by his former writings, but often chooses examples unfitted for his purpose, and overrates features which he considers proofs. He terms the Carolingian minster of Aix-la-Chapelle "a direct copy of the greatest building of Ravenna," and says that "for more than one building in Aachen Ravenna actually supplied the materials." These are misleading statements, which were better modified. The further exemplification of the polygonal choir of the minster, as showing the development of the basilican apse, is without point; the peculiar form was due to its erection on foundations intended for another purpose. The praise bestowed on the proportions of Milan cathedral will surprise alike the architect and the man of taste. The cathedral of Trient is well known as one of the most markedly transitional churches of its style; the arrangement is entirely German, the execution and details for the greater part Northern; yet it is here considered as unmixed Italian Romanesque, and on this view hinges one of the historian's essays.

A further examination into such points would lead too far. The thoroughness of Mr. Freeman's appreciation of his subject may be questioned from the text, yet it is by the illustrations (photographic reproductions of his pen-sketches) that the imperfect comprehension of architectural forms is most clearly seen. It would seem that no one with even rudimentary knowledge could publish such misrepresentations. They are one and all beneath criticism.

Mr. Freeman's literary style, never graceful, is here at its worst. He speaks repeatedly of columns or capitals as "used up again," refers to a cycle as "played out," etc. Many sentences are well-nigh pointless, while the repetition of words is carried to such an excess as to become ludicrous. The reader's attention is distracted by such consecutive passages as these: "Looking to the *building* distinctly as a work of architecture, the Veronese amphitheatre, like all other *buildings* of the same class, brings out in its full perfection the massive grandeur of the *true Roman style of building*. It is the arch, the *true Roman feature*, which gives the *building* its character. The Greek *features* in the more enriched *Roman buildings* act as a mask." And so on down the page. Or again: "Ravenna is a city in which we find ourselves among the *memorials of an age* which has left but few *memorials* elsewhere. The sea which once gave Ravenna its greatness has fallen back, and left the imperial city like a wreck in the wilderness. In like sort the *memory of an age*, strange if not glorious, full of great changes if not of strange deeds, has passed away from other spots without leaving any visible *memorial*; at Ravenna the *memorials of that age* are well-nigh all that is left," etc. A fondness for the ancient or foreign names of cities, in preference to the terms in present English usage, is made very noticeable; thus, we read Ariminum, Faesole, Cumæ, and so on, while German towns are called Trier, Aachen, Köln, with an affectation that ill accords with the repeated misspelling of Innsbruck, and the use of the noun *Dóm* with a small letter.

Mr. Freeman is a great historian, his writings may be said to have created an epoch in English history; in one of them, a former volume of essays, he expresses his contempt for "loose and inaccurate writers, who theorize about facts they imperfectly know" or understand. Our criticism is not incompatible with profound respect for Mr. Freeman's services in his chosen province, but he should recognize its limits. As far as this aggressive little volume concerns itself with architecture it is unreliable, almost illiterate, and its illustrations are an affront to the reader and to art.

*On English Adjectives in -able*, with special reference to *Reliable*. By Fitzedward Hall, C.E., M.A., Hon. D.C.L. Oxon., etc., etc. (London: Trübner & Co. 1877.)—We despair of giving any concise account of the contents of this work. The author himself did not foresee them, and in fact supposed that he was writing a chapter of a paper on '*Reliable, Dilation*, and their Respective Congeners,' when presently he found that he had a book on his hands. Moreover, he was taking up the cudgels on behalf of a word for which he professes no particular affection, and which, as he tells us on p. 172, he has used but once "in the course of some eight thousand printed pages, mostly quite unknown and altogether likely to remain so." And on this single occasion, to show that the use of it was not a lapse, he stepped aside to discuss, "at some length, the disputed legitimacy of the expression." Digressions of this sort are still in order, now that *reliable* has become the subject not of a foot-note but of a book. "On no small number of interesting topics here discussed," says the preface, "one will fruitlessly explore, in quest of information, any and all of our grammars and dictionaries, including both the latest and the most copious." This is pre-eminently the merit of Dr. Hall's philological writings, and it has some very remarkable illustrations in the volume before us—so many, in fact, that his apologetic *sed hoc extra callem* on p. 67 almost excites a smile.

For example, who would expect to find, and who will not prize highly when it is thrown in, a discussion of the derivation of the word *recover* filling nearly twenty pages of fine print, and running off into an excursus about the use of *recover* in such phrases as "to recover our surprise." Similarly, and more appropriately, *rely* is discussed in three solid pages. The etymology of *lopsy-turvy* calls for nine, and very intricate it is, being subject to amendment even in the appendix. Incidentally, the former use of the word *party* for *person*, which has now become vulgar, is illustrated by five pages of select passages, including some which now "look scarcely reverent," as "He that is here meant by 'the horn of salvation' is Jesus Christ. . . . If he, then, be the *party* whom all the prophets pointed at, as the alone restorer of mankind," etc. Most welcome and most valuable are the rules for spelling with *-able* or *-ible*, and curious are the long lists of disused adjectives in *-able* that good writers have hazarded in times past. Among the well-established "neuter rhematic adjectives" (i.e., adjectives having a verb for the base) with this ending, the mention of *agreeable* reminds Dr. Hall that the familiar meaning of "consenting," "willing," is by no means an innovation. "Sir John Paston wrote, in 1465: 'I cannot in no wyse fynde hyr a *greeble* that ye scholde have her dowter [daughter].'" On p. 28 an old controversy is touched on by the citing of still earlier examples of the use of *is being* and *was being* (1769 and 1779); while Henry More (1653) furnishes an instance of the present passive participle ("acting and being acted upon") which naturally led up to the constructions just exemplified. Finally, let us notice the side-remark on the irregularity of the Latin *meridionalis*. "Was it suggested by *septentrionalis*, on a false analogy?"

But it is time that we should ourselves have something to say about *reliable*. Dr. Hall approaches it by selecting a type of the class "who talk and write as if they thought that a knowledge of philology comes by inspiration, and has inspired themselves in particular," and his victim is no other than Mr. Fitzjames Stephen, who had had the hardihood to denounce as nicknames the words *necessist* and *phenomenist*. It is not long before Mr. Edward A. Freeman's scalp is made to dangle from the same girdle, for having declared *reliable* an "American corruption"; and the average Briton's soon forms a third trophy, without which Dr. Hall cannot comfortably settle down to his task. A popular London journal is credited with the assertion that no scholar and no gentleman would ever think of enduring so unnecessary, monstrous, and plebeian an expression. "And here," breaks in, or breaks out, Dr. Hall (p. 40)—

"And here, not unseasonably, I would make a remark on the spell which, it seems, may be cast on almost any Briton by the term *gentleman*. Whoever it may be that takes upon himself to pronounce that this thing, or that, or the other is 'unbecoming a gentleman,' an Englishman who, on hearing such a judgment passed, is not immediately subdued into ac-



quiescence, may be accounted a man of unusual boldness and independence. Whatever is condemned by this potent formula, no matter who the condemner may be, the effect upon it is, very commonly, regarded as much the same with that which, in ancient times, was, in some parts of the globe, supposed to be supernaturally wrought on a person who had been cursed. The character of the curser was nothing; but the curse was everything, and, by its own intrinsic efficacy, entailed, it was thought, inevitable fulfilment."

The earliest occurrence of *reliable* in our literature that Dr. Hall has discovered is in a "speech by William Pitt as manipulated by Coleridge," that appeared in the *Morning Post* of February 18, 1800. That Pitt himself used the word is not confirmed by the contemporary reports. Coleridge used it frequently afterwards, and introduced also *reliability* and *unreliableness*. In the first instance he coupled *reliable* with "pledge," thus indicating what Dr. Hall considers its proper employment: to qualify things, as *trustworthy* qualifies persons. The two words are not strictly synonymous, and *reliable*, if not indispensable, is very convenient and has been adopted by the best circles. There is a sufficient number of adjectives in *-able* whose formation is strictly analogous to that of *reliable*, and which yet pass current unopposed; there are still other cases, like the word *laughable*, that offer some doubt, since the base appears to be the noun rather than the verb, though the objector may fairly be challenged to prove this. Any Shaksperian commentator who interprets Hamlet's "questionable shape" by "easy and willing to be conversed with," assumes as the base "the rhematic phrase *question with*," and furnishes an exact match for *reliable*. Dr. Hall sums up by saying that *reliable* expresses what cannot be expressed by any other one word, conveys an idea of constant recurrence, and can only be avoided by the exact by a periphrasis; it is far from being dissonant, and has been recognized as acceptable by the popular instinct. "That it fails to comport with an analogy of other than narrow scope, is the single point where, philologically considered, it is weak." Regarding it as a prisoner at the bar arraigned for wilful murder, our learned judge directs an acquittal on the ground of justifiable homicide; and the popular verdict is that "though, as all impartial observers admit, it was very irregular for X to slay Y, still it is felt to be for the public good that the troublesome creature [periphrasis] is no longer in the way"—a verdict not unlike what we may suppose posterity's to be on the Russo-Turkish war.

This small but pregnant book deserves the admiration not only of those who have been annoyed by purists and disgusted by philological charlatans, but by all who desire an accurate knowledge of the development of their mother-tongue.

*Field Paths and Green Lanes*; Being Country Walks chiefly in Surrey and Sussex. By Louis J. Jennings. Illustrated with sketches by J. W. Whymper. (New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1878).—The mere title of this book will win the love of Americans, for whom the descriptions of English lanes are apt to be the best part of English novels. Pedestrian travels, too, are always good reading; these alone can give the real details of a landscape, and it is only the pedestrian in these days who has time to chat with anybody. Mr. Jennings, moreover, gives us some really charming sketches of places that can never be too often described, such as Penshurst and the Deepdene; and he also gives some racy conversations with rustics, in which he himself sustains the unusual part of a travelled Conservative and a half-Americanized Tory. He is frank and honest, too, and does not shrink from showing when his way-side friends have parried his thrusts promptly. Thus, one of them says longingly, of a son who has emigrated: "He's a doin' well—they say you can have your own cottage out there. If you pay for it? Ah, but here you can't have it, whether you pay for it or not" (p. 165). This is the precise point—the hopeless pre-occupation of every foot of land—which so often depresses the heart of an American amid the loveliest scenery of England. Mr. Jennings's stereotyped answer, "Why not?" though it may exculpate the individual landholder, does not evade the evil.

There is not, however, much political philosophy in the book, but the author's residence in the United States supplies him with some other materials, quotations from Emerson and Thoreau, backwoods jokes, and a habit of looking for the English origin of alleged Americanisms. He finds in Sussex "mad" used for "angry"; "fall" for "autumn"; "reckon" for "think"; and "gives out" for "fails." All these are usually cited as Americanisms; and it is, indeed, rather a source of regret that the pretty word "fall" is not indigenous. On the other hand, Mr. Jennings himself uses what is often mentioned as an undeniable Americanism, the word "opened up" (p. 289). In general, he is staunchly English, even in vindicating the charms of his native climate;

but he heaps contempt on English fishing-boats, saying of these about Hastings:

"No improvement can have been made for two hundred years. To see one of these big, hulking, unwieldy craft, and then think of the American fishing-boat, with its graceful lines and its white sails, easily managed and capable of great speed, excites one's astonishment afresh at the obstinacy with which our countrymen cling to whatever they may have been in the habit of using, no matter at what loss or inconvenience" (p. 22).

Nothing in the book has more flavor than the few glimpses of the local reputation, or want of reputation, of Mr. Tennyson at his summer retreat of Blackdown. Even at the Isle of Wight, only a few years ago, an American traveller found that the intelligent young fellow who drove a fly from Newport to Farringford had never heard the poet's name; and it is not strange that Mr. Jennings was answered at Haslemere: "Tennyson? Tennyson? I never heard of that name." However, when it came to a choice of a coachman, the English tourist was more fortunate, for his driver told him, when in view of the laureate's house:

"The old gentleman doesn't like to see strangers about his place, but he won't say anything to you. In fact, he seldom speaks to anybody, but goes walking about with his head down. Writes books, I believe—not that I've read 'em. Something about poetry, an't they, sir?" (p. 136).

Let us not, however, indulge in premature exultations. The innocent stranger in New York still has his attention called, in public places, to that eminent New York alderman who pointed out to an English nobleman the bust of Alexander von Humboldt, in Central Park, with the remark that he did not see what Dr. Helmbold had done to deserve that position, being nothing at best but an apothecary.

*The Bride of the Rhine*: Two Hundred Miles in a Mosel Row-boat. By George E. Waring, jr. Reprinted (with additions) from *Scribner's Monthly*. (Boston: J. R. Osgood & Co.)—Colonel Waring is, on the whole, the best of that band of travellers who report themselves in *Scribner's Monthly*. His "Farmer's Vacation" won just praise and popularity, though it dealt with regions comparatively familiar. It might also be charged with the defect of being too literary for farmers and too agricultural for all others. But we have here a trip undertaken for pure enjoyment—it is not even called a vacation, though it is one; whereas the other trip, though a vacation nominally, yet brought out a good deal of hard work. "The Bride of the Rhine," as the German poet Otto terms the river Mosel, is the subject of a book quite as attractive as its predecessor.

A summer holiday, indeed, was this boating on the beautiful river—"the blue Moselle" of songs, the "Mosella" of the Latin poet Ausonius. The stream is simply an unspoiled Rhine, with heights as picturesque, vineyards as continuous, ruins as picturesque, and villages far more unchanged and mediæval. Brick and timber architecture, quaintly carved, is to be seen on every side, and those picturesque fronts at which the American visitor stares so eagerly in the half-modernized Chester are the ordinary style of village houses on the Mosel banks. These delights culminate in the wonderful Schloss Eltz, a building without its peer in the world, having remained for eight centuries in the uninterrupted possession of the same family, and preserving unchanged their accumulated relics—portraits, arms, furniture, and traditions. It stands on a hill, in the centre of a wooded valley; it is accessible only by a high and narrow drawbridge, and had the drawbridge fallen to give passage to a cuirassed robber-knight and his retainers, going out for plunder, our travellers would scarcely have been astonished. A capital engraving of this unique castle forms the frontispiece to the book, and a multiplicity of other woodcuts enables us to justify for ourselves the enthusiastic descriptions of the author. In the rapid disappearance of old-time beauty from the more travelled routes of Europe a debt of gratitude is due to one who thus pursues the picturesque into its delightful by-ways.

*Geschichte des Vatikanischen Concils*. Von J. Friedrich. Vol. I. (Bonn, 1877; New York: B. Westermann & Co.)—In this volume, the beginning of a more extended work, Dr. Friedrich presents the *Vorgeschichte*—the preliminary events that led to the Great Council and paved the way for the dogma of Infallibility. In the table of contents, which covers thirty-two pages, a summary view is presented of the subjects treated in the work. It is a history of Ultramontanism, which starts with the period antecedent to the French Revolution; describes the movement of Lamennais, De Maistre, and their successors in France; traces to its origin the corresponding movement in Germany and Switzerland, and reviews the administration of Pius IX. prior to the assembling of the Coun-

eil. It embodies much interesting information. Friedrich was in attendance at the Vatican Council as a theologian attached to Cardinal Hohenlohe. He is a pupil, colleague, and friend of Döllinger. His hostility to "Vaticanism" is too strong to render it possible for him to give an entirely impartial delineation of its rise and characteristics. In truth, he founds his claim to be considered impartial on his low opinion of his adversaries, whom he pronounces incapable of improvement from any polemical treatment of their doctrines and conduct. Apart from the ardor of feeling, Dr. Friedrich is an instructive guide.

*Two Years behind the Plough; or, The Experience of a Pennsylvania Farm-boy.* Giving a true and faithful account of life on a Bucks County farm as he found it during an apprenticeship of two years. (Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. 1878. 12mo, pp. 224.)—The "two years behind the plough" were passed by a Philadelphia boy who had a longing for a country life, upon the farm of a Bucks County Quaker. The merit of the story is in being a well-told and apparently truthful picture of a particular phase of American life a generation ago; and this gives real value to a story which is itself commonplace, with little incident and no effort at elaborately-drawn characters. Nevertheless, the characters are vividly presented, and are good types of their class—the hard-working, close-listed small farmer and his wife, who had little thought of anything but money-making, who were saving to the degree of meanness, with a temper which was at times harsh and unjust, and nevertheless with human virtues; so that the boy who had spent under their roof two years of hard work and shabby fare had a kindly enough

feeling towards them to come back when he was a man, and visit his old master as a welcome and not unwilling guest.

## BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.	Publishers.—Prices.
Davis (Mrs. R. H.), <i>A Law unto Herself</i> .....	(J. T. Lippincott & Co.) \$1 00
Encyclopædia Britannica, Vol. VII.....	(Little, Brown & Co.)
Ford (Mrs. S. B.), <i>Ernest Quest: a Tale</i> .....	(Sheldon & Co.) 1 50
Gardner (E. C.), <i>Home Interiors</i> .....	(J. R. Osgood & Co.)
Grove (G.), <i>Dictionary of Music and Musicians, Part I, swd.</i> .....	(Macmillan & Co.) 1 25
Hammond (Dr. W. A.), <i>Cerebral Hyperæmia</i> .....	(G. P. Putnam's Sons) 1 00
Harper's <i>Weekly</i> , Vol. XXI.....	(Harper & Bros.)
Monk, Vol. X.....	" "
Huxley (Prof. T. H.), <i>Manual of the Anatomy of Invertebrated Animals</i> .....	(D. Appleton & Co.)
Keary (C. F.), <i>The Dawn of History</i> .....	(Mozley & Smith)
Kraus (J.), <i>Letters to Fanny Brawne</i> .....	(Scribner, Armstrong & Co.) 1 50
Kinsley (Rev. C.), <i>All-saints' Day, and Other Sermons</i> .....	" "
Koolman (J. ten D.), <i>Wörterbuch der Ostfriesischen Sprache, Part III, swd.</i> .....	(B. Westermann & Co.)
Lecky (W. E. H.), <i>History of England in the Eighteenth Century, 2 vols.</i> .....	(D. Appleton & Co.)
Leighton (R. F.), <i>Harvard Examination Papers</i> .....	(Ginn & Heath)
Linsey (C.), <i>Rome in Canada</i> .....	(Lovell Brothers)
Littre (E.), <i>Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Langue française, Parts 9, 10, 11, 12, swd.</i> .....	(F. W. Christern)
Martin (F.), <i>Statesman's Year-book for 1878</i> .....	(Macmillan & Co.) 3 51
Newcomb (Prof.), <i>Popular Astronomy</i> .....	(Harper & Bros.) 4 00
Nicholson (Prof. H. A.), <i>Ancient Life-History of the Earth</i> .....	(D. Appleton & Co.)
Scott (Sir W.), <i>Poetical Works, 5 vols.</i> .....	(Houghton, Osgood & Co.) 8 75
Spofford (A. R.), <i>An American Almanac for 1878</i> .....	(American News Co.)
Stevens (H.), <i>The Bible in the Caxton Exhibition, 1877, Scribner, Welford &amp; Armstrong</i> .....	" "
Story (W. W.), <i>A Roman Lawyer in Jerusalem: Poetry, swd.</i> .....	(A. K. Loring)
Streeton (Hesba), <i>Through a Needle's Eye</i> .....	(Dodd, Mead & Co.) 1 50
Taylor (R. W.), <i>Short Greek Syntax</i> .....	(Hivingsons)
Taylor (W. H.), <i>Four Years with General Lee</i> .....	(D. Appleton & Co.)
Toner (Dr. J. M.), <i>On the Geological Age of the World</i> .....	(Washington)
Tappinett (Dr. P.), <i>Anthropology</i> .....	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.) 2 00
Trolopp (T. A.), <i>Life of Pius IX</i> .....	(Craig & Taylor)
Walker (Prof. F. A.), <i>International Exhibition, 1876, Reports and Awards, swd.</i> .....	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.) 1 50
Watson (G.), <i>The Universe of Language</i> .....	(A. S. Barnes & Co.) 75
Webber (C. H.), and Nevins (W. S.), <i>Old Naumkeag</i> .....	(Authors' Pub. Co.) 1 51
	(Lee & Shepard)

## The Hon. Miss Ferrard,

*A Novel of English and Irish Life, by a new author of exceptional promise, is now ready in the Leisure-Hour Series. 16mo, \$1.*

## Chauncey Wright's Philosophical Discussions

*will appear immediately in a new impression, the first impression being exhausted. The London "Academy" calls the author's "one of the finest philosophical minds which America or any country has produced." 8vo, \$3 50.*

HENRY HOLT & CO., NEW YORK.

NOW READY

NEW EDITION OF HIGGINS'S GREAT WORK.

## The Anacalypsis;

*An attempt to draw aside the Veil of the Saitic Isis; or, An Enquiry into the Origin of Languages, Nations, and Religions. By GODFREY HIGGINS, Esq. Vol. I., 8vo, cloth, \$4 50. 550 pp. To be completed in four volumes.*

The extreme rarity and consequent high price of the 'Anacalypsis' has hitherto placed it beyond the reach of many scholars and students. The new edition is issued in a much more convenient form, and sold at less than one-sixth of the price of the original.

The powerful though rather dogmatic logic and the profound learning of the author give the work a singular importance; and in a thinking age, when many things formerly considered truths are passing away into the shadows of tradition, the student of comparative mythology and the origin of religion and languages will look upon Higgins's 'Anacalypsis' as his guide and luminary through the darkness of dawning science.

J. W. BOUTON, 706 Broadway, N. Y.

*Mr. Snider's work on Shakespeare has NOT received the unqualified approval of the press East and West, as previously stated. The New York papers have demolished it: the "World" in two columns, the "Times" in three columns, and other papers in less space. The Boston press commend it highly. The "Advertiser," "Globe," "Courier," "Transcript," "Times," and others pronounce it able, scholarly, interesting, valuable, showing deep study, having (what was not considered possible in a work on Shakespeare) great "originality." The Western press generally coincide in the views held in Boston. Individual critics are, as far as heard from, less divided in opinion. Dr. Wm. T. Harris gives general expression to their opinions in saying: "It is one of the most daring labors ever undertaken by a critic; and, if Mr. Snider had signally failed in every point named, still he would deserve admiration for his courage." Dr. Harris goes on to show that Mr. Snider has been signally successful. "When doctors disagree who shall decide?" The 'System of Shakespeare's Dramas' has been most extravagantly praised, and has been pronounced the most unmitigated bosh. What next?*

## INDUSTRIAL ART.

A NEW ILLUSTRATED MONTHLY OF  
*Technical and Scientific Education*

JANUARY NUMBER NOW READY.

\$4 per annum. 40 cents per part.  
Specimen number mailed on receipt of 30 cents.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO., PUBLISHERS  
PHILADELPHIA.

## JUST PUBLISHED.

A VALUABLE WORK.

## The Electoral System OF THE UNITED STATES.

A Critical and Historical Exposition of its Fundamental Principles in the Constitution, and of the Acts and Proceedings of Congress enforcing it.

By DAVID A. MCKNIGHT.

8vo, extra cloth, \$3.

"Mr. McKnight's book is valuable, both as giving a good history of the late Presidential contest and as being a well-digested treatise on our method of elections."—*Chicago Tribune*.

"A hand-book of standard authority. We cordially commend the volume to the attention of our public men."—*Pittsburgh Chronicle*.

"The plan of the 'exposition' is comprehensive, and it has been carried out with an ability which is backed by painstaking perseverance."—*Philadelphia Inquirer*.

"The author details in an interesting manner the origin of the existing system, points out its good features, and exposes the defects in its working. Finally, he lays down the plan which he thinks would remedy all the latter, preventing a recurrence of the troubles of the late Presidential election, and otherwise contributing to the peace and safety of the nation."—*Cincinnati Gazette*.

For sale by Booksellers, or will be sent by mail, post-paid, upon receipt of the price, by

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO., Publishers,  
715 and 717 Market Street, Philadelphia.

## WARE'S ARTISTIC DESIGNS FOR Scroll Sawyers.

These designs are engraved in the best manner, and are unrivalled for Beauty and Finish.

ILLUSTRATED CATALOGUE ON APPLICATION.

JOHN WILKINSON, Publisher,  
53 and 55 Lake Street, Chicago.

## Magazine of American History.

The First Volume of the Magazine has become so scarce that it can be supplied only with great difficulty. Orders for it will be received, however, and will be filled if possible as rapidly as the numbers can be procured and in the order in which the subscriptions are received. No additional copies will be printed, however.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, \$5 A YEAR; 50 CENTS A NUMBER.

Published by A. S. BARNES & CO.,  
New York and Chicago.

## CLEOPATRA'S NEEDLE.

An accurate photograph of this ancient wonder, TAKEN ON THE SPOT (Alexandria), showing distinctly the hieroglyphics covering its surface. Will be sent, post-paid, on receipt of 25 cents, by  
E. H. HILL, 36 Broadway, Brooklyn, E. D.



